

II.4 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES: AGENCIES (LOCAL)

CONTENTS

II.4	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES: AGENCIES (LOCAL)	II-67
II.4.1	Comment Set A1: City of Huntington Beach Department of Community Development.....	II-68
II.4.2	Comment Set A2: City of Huntington Beach Environmental Board.....	II-70
II.4.3	Comment Set A3: Irvine Ranch Water District	II-80
II.4.4	Comment Set A4: Santa Margarita Water District.....	II-119
II.4.5	Comment Set A5: South Coast Air Quality Management District.....	II-121

The master responses provided in Section II.2, *Master Responses, MR-1 through MR-8*, address similar comments received from multiple commenters on the Draft Supplemental EIR and, therefore, many individual responses to comments refer back to the master responses. These Master Responses are:

- MR-1, Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action
- MR-2, Lease Modification Project Scope
- MR-3, Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR
- MR-4, Piecemealing
- MR-5, Diffuser Entrainment Mortality and Species Affected
- MR-6, Marine Protected Areas
- MR-7, Cumulative Impacts
- MR-8, Alternatives

II.4.1 Comment Set A1: City of Huntington Beach Department of Community Development



City of Huntington Beach

2000 MAIN STREET

CALIFORNIA 92648

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Planning Division

714/536-5271

Code Enforcement Division

714/375-5155

Building Division

714/536-5241

July 26, 2017

Alexandra Borack
Project Manager
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Ave., Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825
Submitted via email: CEQA.comments@slc.ca.gov

Subject: Notice of Availability of the Draft SEIR for the Seawater Desalination Project at Huntington Beach: Outfall/Intake Modifications and Lease Amendment

Dear Ms. Borack:

The City of Huntington Beach has reviewed the above referenced Draft SEIR and submits the following comments:

Public Works Department comments

1. Page 2-31, Table 2-6, Option 1, the debris from the manual cleaning of the wedgewire screens are expected to be passively swept from the intake location. Due to the copper-nickel alloy wedgewire screens having the potential to cause significant impacts, mitigation measures should at a minimum require the debris from the manual cleaning to be vacuumed in lieu of floating away.
2. Page 4-32, APM-3, include an emergency contact list for the contractor including a 24-hour phone number in case of emergencies.

A1-1

A1-2

Fire Department comments

3. The HBFD requests further clarification on how the intake/outfall location will be identified. The HBFD Marine Safety Division will need to be aware of the location of this equipment for future knowledge.

A1-3

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft SEIR. Should you have any questions about this letter, please contact me at (714)536-5624 or via email at rramos@surfcity-hb.org.

Sincerely,

Ricky Ramos
Senior Planner

cc: Fred A. Wilson, City Manager
Scott Hess, Director of Community Development
Jennifer Villasenor, Planning Manager
Steve Bogart, Senior Civil Engineer
Steve Eros, Fire Protection Analyst

RESPONSE TO COMMENT SET A1: HUNTINGTON BEACH DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- A1-1 In its June 26, 2017, comments on the Draft Supplemental EIR, Poseidon submitted a change to its California State Lands Commission (Commission or CSLC) lease amendment application to include a new Applicant Proposed Measure-8 (APM-8): Composition and Maintenance of Wedgewire Screens. Pursuant to APM-8: (1) the composition of the screens shall be stainless steel (unless Poseidon demonstrates to the satisfaction of Commission, Water Boards, and Coastal Commission staffs that use of copper-nickel alloy screens would not result in chemical leaching in excess of California Ocean Plan Water Quality Objectives for Protection of Marine Life); and (2) the screens shall be maintained through boat-based air-burst cleaning methods. Cleaning is intended to prevent any obstruction to the intake due to biofouling and is estimated to occur every other month. No mitigation for cleaning copper debris is required since copper would not be present (no impact) or would have been demonstrated to have no or less than significant impacts.
- A1-2 Pursuant to APM-3, Poseidon shall prepare and submit to Commission staff for approval a Spill Prevention and Response Plan that among other details will include the designation of the on-site person with responsibility for implementing the Plan (5th bullet) and a “telephone contact list” of regulatory and trustee agencies (last bullet). One or more 24-hour emergency phone numbers will be provided as part of the Plan.
- A1-3 The intake/outfall locations will be the existing locations of the intake/outfall pipeline towers currently used by the Huntington Beach Generating Station Once-Through Cooling system (see locations on the back of the front cover of the Supplemental EIR and reproduced for convenience below).

	Latitude	Longitude
End of Intake Pipeline	N 33° 38' 39"	W 117° 58' 43"
End of Outfall Pipeline	N 33° 38' 38"	W 117° 58' 44"

II.4.2 Comment Set A2: City of Huntington Beach Environmental Board



CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
2000 MAIN STREET, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92648-2702

ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD

July 27, 2017

California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

RE: *Poseidon Supplemental EIR Comments*

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Poseidon Desalination Plant at the existing Huntington Beach Generating Station (HBGS). These comments are submitted by the City of Huntington Beach's Environmental Board (Board). The Board is an advisory body to the Huntington Beach City Council and consists of nine Huntington Beach (City) residents whose membership is recommended by City staff and approved by the City Council. The Board's primary responsibility is to review Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) that affect the City and submit its comments to City Council and/or City Planning Commission.

A2-1

After careful consideration, the Board urges the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) to address the following concerns in the Draft Supplemental EIR released in May 2017 (State Clearinghouse No. 2001051092, CSLC EIR Number 794) for the CSLC lease for the proposed Poseidon Desalination project in Huntington Beach.

Before commenting on the Draft Supplemental EIR directly, the Board urges the CSLC to prepare a new EIR in lieu of a supplemental EIR for this project based on CCR Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 11, Section 15162. Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations. Several project parameters have changed since the initial EIR was completed in 2010 and thus by law, a new EIR is required. We brought this to your attention in our letter of December 21, 2016 in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this Draft Supplemental EIR. Our observation is that the considerations for our recommendation are still valid, including:

A2-2

1. Water Source

In addition to the water being brought in from the ocean, once the HBGS has been switched to gas turbine engines and Poseidon is no longer co-locating, the desalination facility will also accept water treated by Orange County Water District to the tertiary level. Since this water is already clean enough to be sent back into the ocean and is potable, it doesn't seem like a good use of resources to use large amounts of energy to transport and filter potable water that has already been treated using customer funds.

A2-3

COMMENT SET A2: HUNTINGTON BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD (cont.)**2. Water Requirements**

Prior to this 2010 EIR, the State was using many more gallons of water than are currently being consumed. With the drought restrictions and education on conservation, the demand for water in this area has changed and thus the need for this type of project should be re-evaluated.

A2-4

3. Water Recovery Capacity at OCWD

The Orange County Water District's Groundwater Replenishment System originally produced 70 million gallons of water per year, but after several expansion efforts, the District can now produce 130 million gallons of water per year. This increased capacity places additional burden of justification on the proposed desalination project.

A2-5

4. Cumulative Impacts of Additional Projects

In addition, it is our assertion that the cumulative impacts of concurrent and neighboring projects: the upgrade of the HBGS, the redevelopment of the adjacent property known locally as the "Tank Farm," the clean-up of the ASCON landfill Superfund site, as well as the revelation that treated water is planned to be transmitted to the site after co-location operations cease, qualify to require that "[a]n EIR must analyze cumulative impacts whenever a proposed project's individual impacts have the potential to combine with related impacts from other projects to compound environmental harm . . ."

A2-6

Comments on the Draft Supplemental EIR

The Draft Supplemental EIR discusses a large number of potential impacts from the proposed project and potential mitigation measures. The Board makes a general comment that throughout the document, much of this discussion is speculative and so the true project impacts are difficult to assess. For purposes of this letter we focus our comments on impacts which have been identified as Significant and Unmitigated (highlighted in Table ES-4), or are otherwise identified by the Board as points of particular concern.

A2-7

4.1 Ocean Water Quality and Marine Biological Resources

Impact and Mitigation items OWQ/MB-5 (Impact to Ocean Water Quality from Wedgewire Screen and Diffuser Operation and Maintenance) and OWQ/MB-7 (Impact to Special Status Species Populations of Diffuser Operation indicated Significant and Unmitigated impacts from Project operations. There are several issues associated with these impacts but from a design perspective there appear to be three principal issues: Adequacy of the existing pipelines, Intake design and operation, Outfall design and operation.

A2-8

Adequacy of the existing pipelines

The 2010 Final Subsequent EIR stated:

"The existing discharge pipeline was not designed for high levels of pressure, which immediately rules out conventional multi-ported diffusers that utilize many small diameter diffuser ports to create high velocity, super-critical discharge jets to induce initial dilution. If retrofitted to the discharge tower, such designs would result in too much back-pressure for the existing pipeline to maintain structural integrity. The existing discharge tower produces a discharge point about mid-depth in the water column, making the retrofit of a conventional diffuser with lateral discharge arms infeasible from a structural strength and support perspective."

COMMENT SET A2: HUNTINGTON BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD (cont.)

The 2017 Draft Supplemental EIR has reevaluated this statement to assess the ability of the existing pipe to be employed safely for the new diffuser design. The principal analysis cited is a Technical Memorandum by Alden (Appendix H-1) which estimates the head loss. However, the memorandum by GHD (to which Alden was a subcontractor) and the EIR make it clear that an engineering inspection of the pipe is planned for the permitting stage.

A2-8
cont.

The Board wishes to inquire the contingency plans and impact on the project should defects be found at this stage, as well as during the periodic inspections which are called for during the life of the project.

In addition, if the desalination plant would be projected to outlive the piping system, the impacts of repairing or replacing the intake and outfall systems should be addressed.

A2-9

Intake Design and Operation

The revised intake design features a 1 mm wire mesh screen to minimize intake of aquatic life. However, the expert analysis (in particular as documented in Appendix F-1) indicate a substantial amount of aquatic life at the project location will still pass through the mesh and be killed. The Board wishes to see an analysis of the resulting ecological impacts associated directly with these new estimates, beyond a comparative analysis with the earlier project proposal.

A2-10

Because the proposed design is not a subsurface intake, it is not compliant with current California regulations for desalination plants. Therefore, a variance in design, engineering and permitting requirements would be necessary to approve the project as presented. This variance will not benefit the community or the environment of Huntington Beach.

A2-11

One alternative design considered in the Draft Supplemental EIR is Rotating Brush-Cleaned, Stainless Steel Wedgewire Screens, which have certain operational advantages including reduced manual cleaning. Nevertheless, this option introduces a mechanical element in the ocean environment which itself needs to be maintained. The plan for that maintenance as well as the impact of failure of the rotating mechanism should be detailed.

A2-12

Outfall Design and Operation

The technical studies (in particular as documented in Appendix F-1) assert that local salinity reaches acceptable levels at a certain distance from the redesigned outfall based on averaged metrics. However, such metrics do not reflect actual hazards caused by unmixed plumes which may persist for much greater distances. For that reason, the proposed diffuser design should be subject to Computational Fluid Dynamic (CFD) modeling showing true projected mixing behavior for a representative set of ocean current conditions. This modeling methodology is well established and provides a degree of analysis which, while not as accurate as actual field measurements, is superior to the rough estimates employed in the current EIR documents. The analysis should also include impacts from the estimated effect of gradual degradation on the inlet and outlet on plant operation and on the salinity distribution.

A2-13

COMMENT SET A2: HUNTINGTON BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD (cont.)***Overall Design/Operating Considerations***

The Board wishes to clarify what regulatory agencies will be in charge of enforcing compliance with each of the mitigation measures in the final EIR, and also indicate the source of funding that agency has to enforce the measures. If there is no agency currently charged with enforcement, indicate how the Mitigation Measures will be enforced and what source of funds the agency charged with enforcement will use. Describe the powers that agency will have to stop operations at the proposed Poseidon desalination plant to prevent environmental harm and how those powers will be granted/exist.

A2-14

Part of the mitigation plan for the Significant and Unmitigated Impacts to ocean life is restoration of a nearby wetland for the life of the proposed project. If this plan is to be implemented the long term monitoring and enforcement plan needs to be detailed. However, the Board asserts that trading local ocean life for wetlands life is not a true equivalency, especially since parallel efforts are being investigated for restoration of those same wetlands while no equivalent restoration project for the local ocean life is anticipated.

A2-15

Sections 4.3 and 4.6: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

Impact and Mitigation items AQ-1 (Air Emissions from Construction) and CMLTV-AQ-1 (Cumulative Air Emissions from Construction) indicated Significant and Unmitigated impacts of the offshore construction operation. Onsite mitigation includes a Diesel Fuel Reduction Plan and an Internal Combustion Engine Emissions Reduction Plan. It is concluded that "The cumulative impact of Lease Modification Project construction activities remains significant and unavoidable even after implementation" of the local mitigation plans. Greenhouse gas emissions are asserted to be sufficiently addressed by Project design features.

A2-16

The Board suggests a more thorough re-evaluation of both the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas conclusions in determining project approval. A number of technologies (including alternative fuels and well-established means of air emissions source reduction) exist to significantly address on-site release of criteria air pollutants. Greenhouse gas emissions may also benefit from application of some of these technologies.

Section 4.8: Noise and Vibration

Impact and Mitigation items OWQ/MB-3 (Impact to Special Status Species Populations and Movement of Marine Mammal Species as a Result of Underwater Noise during Construction) indicated Significant and Unmitigated impacts of the offshore construction operation. Onsite mitigation including modifications to the underwater construction plan, focused primarily on the mitigating the impacts of pile driving. The analysis of effects on aquatic life focused primarily on near-field hazards of high decibel noise on various species, but also acknowledged that behavior of some species including marine mammals could be impacted over a much larger radius. The Board recommends that long-distance impacts be considered in more detail and the proposed monitoring of these impacts be detailed, including the detailed plan and expert staffing for this monitoring.

A2-17

COMMENT SET A2: HUNTINGTON BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD (cont.)

Thank you for taking our concerns and recommendations this Draft Supplemental EIR into consideration.

Sincerely,

Jessica Budica
Chair, Huntington Beach Environmental Board

Additional members include: Debbie Killey (Vice Chair), Mark Sheldon (Secretary), Jeff Coffman, Michelle Claud-Clemente, Kyle Scrimgeour, Tony Soriano and Shawn Thompson.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT SET A2: HUNTINGTON BEACH ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD

- A2-1 These are introductory statements that do not raise significant environmental issues.
- A2-2 The California State Lands Commission (Commission or CSLC) stands by its determination, provided in Supplemental EIR Section 1.4, *Purpose and Scope of Supplemental EIR*, that the proper scope for the Lease Modification Project is that provided in Poseidon's lease amendment application and described in Supplemental EIR Section 2, *Project Description*, that preparation of a Supplemental EIR is appropriate for evaluation of the potential significant impacts associated with the Lease Modification Project, and that a new complete review of the 50 MGD HB Desalination Plant Project approved in 2010 does not consider the extensive environmental review that has already occurred, the Applicant's vested rights, the characteristics of the proposed modifications, and other considerations. See master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, and MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*.
- A2-3 As discussed in master response MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, any Commission discretionary action taken on the Lease Modification Project would not affect the 2010 approval by the City of Huntington Beach (City) for the onshore Huntington Beach Desalination Plant Project. Decisions regarding how desalinated water in Orange County may be used and distributed onshore must be appropriately made by the City or Orange County Water District (OCWD). As discussed in master response MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*, the OCWD has reiterated that it "has not reached any conclusions or made any decisions regarding how desalinated [water]

could be used by the District and distributed to the local water community, so no specific conveyance and utilization option has been formally selected.” (Letter from Michael R. Markus, General Manager, to The Honorable Gavin Newsom, State Lands Commission, September 8, 2017.) Therefore, potential changes in the distribution of desalinated water onshore or commingling with treated water are speculative at this time and are not germane to the offshore Lease Modification Project before the Commission.

- A2-4 See responses A2-2 and A2-3 above and master response MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*, regarding project need.
- A2-5 See responses A2-2 and A2-3 above and master response MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*, regarding project need.
- A2-6 See master response MR-7, *Cumulative Impacts*.
- A2-7 In this comment, the Board provides a general statement that much of the discussion of “potential impacts from the proposed project and potential mitigation measures” is speculative and so future project impacts are difficult to assess. However, no specific examples to support this statement are provided. Potential impacts of the Lease Modification Project (as defined in Section 1.4, *Purpose and Scope of Supplemental EIR*) are identified and analyzed throughout Section 4, *Environmental Setting and Impact Analysis*, of the Supplemental EIR. As noted in master response, MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*, potential future impacts that may be related to the distribution of desalinated water from the onshore Huntington Beach Desalination Plant Project approved by the City of Huntington Beach in 2010 are speculative at this time; however, these impacts are not germane to the offshore Lease Modification Project before the Commission. See also responses A2-2 and A2-3 above and master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission’s Discretionary Action*, and MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*.
- A2-8 Prior to the Commission staff’s finding Poseidon’s lease amendment application to be complete, Commission engineering staff reviewed the Alden (2017a, 2017b) reports on the outfall pipeline discussed in Supplemental EIR Section 2.4.4.1, *Structural Integrity of Outfall Pipeline*, that indicate the proposed diffuser would operate within the design parameters of the pipeline. Based on the current inspection results, no defects to the outfall pipeline have been identified. Commission

Engineering staff will also review and must approve the required Pipeline Integrity Assessment Inspection and Report (Applicant Proposed Lease Condition [APLC]-1) immediately prior to installation of any diffuser on the outfall; any inspection that occurs now may be outdated by the time, or if, the Lease Modification Project receives all its required permits (7 years have already passed since the Commission authorized the use of the outfall pipeline for desalination operations in 2010). Contingency planning for outfall pipeline defects that may be identified in the future is beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR. Should the outfall pipeline need to be repaired or replaced in the future, potential impacts of the remedial action may require separate environmental review under CEQA depending on the scope of any repairs or if any discretionary permit is needed for such action.

- A2-9 See Response to Comment A2-8 regarding assessing the potential environmental impacts of future outfall pipeline repair or replacement, if needed should the approved Huntington Beach Desalination Plant Project outlive the piping system.
- A2-10 Estimated numbers of fish larvae that would be entrained per day by the proposed screened intake are presented in Supplemental EIR Table 4.1-6, Impingement/Entrainment Comparison. As explained in Supplemental EIR Section 1.4.1, *CSLC 2010 Approval and Rationale for Supplemental EIR*, “the CSLC is evaluating the incremental effects associated with the proposed Lease Modification Project when evaluating whether such modifications to the approved 2010 Project would result in any significant environmental impacts.” As such, impacts are identified by comparing changes to the environment caused by Poseidon’s proposed Lease Modification Project activities with the environmental conditions associated with the offshore portions of the intake and discharge facilities analyzed in the 2010 FSEIR. Where the Table 4.1-6 estimates are equal to those analyzed in the 2010 FSEIR (as is the case with co-located intake), the 2010 FSEIR analysis, incorporated by reference in the Supplemental EIR, is relied on to describe impacts. Where these estimates have changed since 2010 (as is the case with the reduction in entrainment for stand-alone intake), the comparative impacts are described under Impact OWQ/MB-6 of the Supplemental EIR.
- A2-11 See master response MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*, Subpart 4D.2, *2015 Desalination Amendment and 2014 and 2015 ISTAP Reports*.
- A2-12 Quarterly (four times per year) dive trips would be conducted to inspect the screens and to manually scrape unbrushed external screen surfaces,

as needed, as stated in Supplemental EIR Section 5.4.2, *Rotating Brush-Cleaned, Stainless Steel Wedgewire Screens Alternative*. Regular maintenance of the rotating screens would occur as needed during these quarterly inspections. In comparison, non-rotating screens would be inspected and manually cleaned every other month (six times per year). Poseidon's technical memo submitted as part of its application for the Lease Modification Project (*Appendix II – Wedgewire Screen Intake Maintenance Plan*) describes the rotating brush-cleaned screen option, and notes that at their best, rotating screens would be automatically cleaned and at their worst, they would function as passive, stationary screens.

- A2-13 The analysis in Impact OWQ/MB-5, *Impact to Ocean Water Quality from Wedgewire Screen and Diffuser Operation and Maintenance*, in Draft Supplemental EIR Section 4.1.4.2, *Operation Impacts*, presents dilution information derived from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-(EPA-) certified COSMOS/FloWorks computational fluid dynamics (CFD) model. After publication of the Draft Supplemental EIR and at the request of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) during its review of Poseidon's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit application, Poseidon updated this analysis, using the EPA-certified mixing model, CORMIX 10.0, and a CFD model, COSMOS/FloWorks. Section 4.1.4.2 is revised to include the results of this new model run, which presents "worst-case" maximum discharge conditions over an entire month. The results showed a reduction in the distance from the point of discharge that the duckbill diffuser would dilute the brine to within 2 ppt of natural background, citing a 2017 document prepared by MBI, *Alternative Hydrodynamic Model Analysis Alden 3-Jet Duckbill Diffuser Retrofit at Huntington Beach Desalination Facility*. Copies of the documents cited in the Supplemental EIR are available upon request from the Commission. The following text is from the 2017 MBI report:

The models were initialized to resolve initial dilution and discharge plume trajectories under standard NPDES dilution modeling protocols (as defined in the California Ocean Plan); according to which 'Initial Dilution will be considered the process which results in the rapid and irreversible turbulent mixing of wastewater with ocean water around the point of discharge'. As such, the models did not consider any additional mixing due to the action of ocean currents, waves, tides or wind and treated the receiving water as a quiescent, stagnant ocean.

The dilution analysis does not consider the effect of gradual degradation of the intake and outfall on salinity distribution, as any estimates of

degradation rates or locations would be speculative. The conditions of the NPDES permit imposed by the RWQCB would require operational testing to monitor any changes to the discharge salinity.

- A2-14 The Commission is the entity responsible for ensuring compliance with each mitigation measure applicable to the Lease Modification Project, as shown in the Mitigation Monitoring Program in Table 7-1 of the Supplemental EIR (see column entitled Responsible Entity), which has been revised in this Final Supplemental EIR to clarify that only the mitigation measures and Applicant-Proposed Measures applicable to the Lease Modification Project are included in Table 7-1. All mitigation measures become conditions of the lease, and are monitored and enforced by the Commission (see Sections 7.1, *Monitoring Authority*, and 7.2, *Enforcement Authority*). Mitigation monitoring will be conducted by a Commission-contracted third-party monitor or Commission staff using reimbursement funds provided to the Commission by the Applicant.
- A2-15 The Applicant must submit to the Commission, Water Boards, and Coastal Commission staffs for approval, and implement, a Diffuser-Operation Marine Life Mitigation Plan specific to the Lease Modification Project that includes minimum requirements, the details of which are specified in Mitigation Measure (MM) OWQ/MB-7. See also Response to Comment A2-14 regarding monitoring and enforcement. Regarding the comment that “trading ocean life for wetlands life is not a true equivalency,” suggesting that MM OWQ/MB-7 would not adequately mitigate impacts to marine larvae, Supplemental EIR Section 4.1.4.2, *Operational Impacts*, has been revised in this Final Supplemental EIR to clarify how the Area of Production Foregone (APF) is used in MM OWQ/MB-7 to determine adequate mitigation for entrainment impacts.
- A2-16 The 2010 FSEIR certified by the City of Huntington Beach (City) requires implementation of MMs CON-14 and CON-15 for Diesel Fuel Reduction and Internal Combustion Engine Emissions Reduction from onshore construction equipment. MMs CON-14a and CON-14b, which apply to the offshore Lease Modification Project, include minimum requirements, the details of which are specified in the MMs. Best available specific emissions control approaches must be identified at the time of plan submittal, and the specific approaches to emissions controls require approval by the City, as the lead agency for implementation of the 2010 Project, and Commission within their respective jurisdictions.
- A2-17 The commenter recommends that a detailed analysis be included for long-distance impacts to marine mammals, as well as detailed plans and staffing for the monitoring during pile driving activities. The Supplemental

EIR discusses the temporary nature of the pile driving activities, and includes implementation of APM-5, *Sensitive Marine Species Monitoring and Mitigation and Best Management Practices (BMPs) Implementation Plan*, which includes detailed elements and minimum requirements such as specific requirements for marine wildlife monitors and their tasks, for review and approval by CSLC staff in consultation with other applicable agencies. In addition, MM OWQ/MB-3a requires that vibratory pile driving be used to mitigate the long-distance impacts to marine mammals, and MMs OWQ/MB-3b and OWQ/MB-3c further mitigate for potential behavioral harassment impacts.

II.4.3 Comment Set A3: Irvine Ranch Water District

VIA EMAIL: CEQA.comments@CSLC.ca.gov
HARD COPY TO FOLLOW

18101 Von Karman Avenue
Suite 1800
Irvine, CA 92612
T 949.833.7800
F 949.833.7878

Mary Lynn Coffee

Refer To File #: 270817-0006

July 27, 2017

Jennifer Lucchesi, Esq.
Executive Director
California State Lands Commission
Suite 100-S
100 Howe Avenue
Sacramento 95825

Re: Poseidon Supplemental Environmental Impact Report Comments

Dear Ms. Lucchesi:

As counsel for, and on behalf of the Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD or District), thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Seawater Desalination Project at Huntington Beach: Outfall/Intake Modifications and General Lease — Industrial Use (PRC 1980.1) Amendment (DSEIR). IRWD is concerned about the Seawater Desalination Project at Huntington Beach (Desal Project),¹ including all of its components, because the District derives the majority its water supply from the Orange County Groundwater Basin (Basin). The District's use of groundwater from the Basin combined with its production and distribution of high quality recycled water are primary factors in IRWD's ability to sustainably and reliably serve the approximately one-half million people in the District's service area daily.

IRWD is not categorically opposed to seawater desalination or the proposed Desal Project. Furthermore, IRWD supports the development of desalination technologies, regulatory streamlining, public acceptance, and pursuit of regional, state, and federal funding programs that would reduce the cost of desalination. Notwithstanding this policy position, as IRWD has publicly expressed for some time, the District is concerned about the potential environmental impacts of the Desal Project, particularly as the project has been changed in the seven years that have passed since it was last subject to comprehensive public review in the City of Huntington Beach's Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse No. 2001051092 (2010) (2010 FSEIR). As it has been changed since the 2010 FSEIR, including its entirely new and different distribution and delivery components, the Desal Project is reasonably likely to result in significant adverse effects on IRWD's local groundwater supplies and recycled water production, affecting the core of IRWD's mission to provide a high quality, safe, and reliable water supply to its customers. Consequently, IRWD is compelled to submit comments on the DSEIR.

¹ The term "Desal Project" is used in this letter to refer generically to the Seawater Desalination Project at Huntington Beach, and is not intended to refer specifically to either the 2010 Desal Project or the Current Desal Project, as defined in the body of this letter below.

A3-1

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.**

This section summarizes IRWD's comments on the DSEIR, noting that additional detail, legal authority, and facts are included in the other sections of this letter that follow this Executive Summary.

A. The DSEIR is an Improper Supplement.

The major problem with the DSEIR is that it is fundamentally an improper supplement to the 2010 FSEIR. The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) has improperly considered approval of the application by Poseidon Resources (Surfside) LLC (Applicant), which requests a lease amendment and approval of certain outfall/intake facility modifications (Outfall/Intake Components), in a vacuum within the DSEIR. The DSEIR examines the Outfall/Intake Components as if they were modifications to the Desal Project described and analyzed in the 2010 FSEIR (2010 Desal Project) ignoring:

- Major changes made to the 2010 Desal Project since the 2010 FSEIR (Current Desal Project),² including, without limitation planning and conceptual design of a completely different delivery and distribution system for the desalinated water (Product Water) produced by the Seawater Desalination Plant at Huntington Beach (HB Desal Plant);³ and
- New information and changed circumstances of substantial importance to the Desal Project that have become known since, and hence were not considered in, the 2010 FSEIR.

In light of the foregoing, the CSLC's preparation and use of the DSEIR to evaluate the proposed modifications to the Outfall/Intake Components is improper due to its misplaced reliance upon the 2010 FSEIR and its analysis of the 2010 Desal Project rather than the Current Desal Project. This violates CEQA because:

1. The City of Huntington Beach (City) has taken the position that it has no further discretionary approvals to grant related to the Desal Project. It is incumbent upon the CSLC, as the next CEQA responsible agency considering a discretionary action,

² The term "Current Desal Project" consists of the 2010 Desal Project plus all modifications to that project since the 2010 FSEIR, including entirely new and different planned distribution and delivery system project components for Product Water, new treatment technologies related to new and different Product Water end use specifications, and modifications to the Outfall/Intake Components under consideration by the CSLC, all of which the Applicant and CEQA reviewing agency rather than those submitting comments under CEQA, remain responsible to comprehensively identify and environmentally review prior to taking discretionary actions. Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14 (CEQA Guidelines), §§ 15121 (informational document), 15124 (project description), 15378 (defining "Project").

³ The definition of the term "Current Desal Project" in this letter is not intended to, and does not replace or relieve the obligation of the Applicant and CEQA reviewing agency to provide a current, accurate, and complete project description, which the DSEIR fails to do in contravention of CEQA as discussed in Section III.C.1. CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15121, 15124, 15378.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

to assume the role of the lead agency for the purpose of conducting any additional and appropriate analysis needed for the project to comply with CEQA, including, but not limited to, completion of subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

A3-3
cont.

2. CEQA precludes reliance via a supplemental EIR upon the now stale and outdated 2010 FSEIR. CEQA requires preparation of a new or subsequent EIR because the 2010 Desal Project has fundamentally changed since 2010, and the major changes to the 2010 Desal Project must be comprehensively analyzed consistent with CEQA prior to or concurrently with review of the Outfall/Intake Components. The 2010 Desal Project relied on direct surface distribution of Product Water to the potable delivery systems of Orange County retail water agencies (Surface/Potable Distribution Components). The Current Desal Project is now proposed to distribute and deliver Product Water by injecting it into the groundwater aquifer and blending it with higher quality groundwater. Then Orange County groundwater producers, including IRWD, pump it from the Basin using their own wells and distribute the water through their own potable distribution systems (Recharge Distribution Components⁴). Recharge Distribution represents a major change to the distribution and delivery system component of the 2010 Desal Project that is likely to result in new significant adverse impacts to, among other resources, groundwater quality and supply. Because the Recharge Distribution Components were not a part of the 2010 Desal Project, any impacts associated with them were not analyzed in the 2010 FSEIR.
3. CEQA requires comprehensive, unsegmented evaluation of the Current Desal Project's environmental impacts, feasible alternatives, and feasible mitigation measures. Serial review and approval by responsible agencies, such as CSLC, focused only on the specific Desal Project components within that responsible agency's jurisdiction "piecemeals" the environmental review of the Current Desal Project. The result is a failure to identify the severity of adverse impacts; a failure to identify and consider a reasonable range of alternatives to avoid or reduce ; and a failure to consider and prescribe all feasible and available mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts of the entire project, as planned.
4. CEQA requires that a new or subsequent EIR (rather than a supplemental EIR) must be prepared to analyze the Outfall/Intake Components in the context of the Current Desal Project, because the Outfall/Intake Components modify the Current Desal Project and not the 2010 Desal Project. Proper evaluation of potential significant adverse impacts of the Outfall/Intake Components requires consideration of the interrelationship and interaction of the various components of the Current Desal Project, including the Recharge Distribution Components and the Outfall/Intake Components. For example, anticipated adverse groundwater quality impacts associated with Recharge Distribution, which result from the injection of Product Water containing a higher total dissolved solids (TDS) concentration into the Basin, might be feasibly mitigated by imposing lower TDS limits on Product Water to protect

A3-4

A3-5

A3-6

⁴ Recharge Distribution Components include OCWD's identified Distribution Option 1A (encompassed within Option 6), *i.e.*, the 100% Recharge Option, and all associated injection wells, pump stations, associated pipelines, and other facilities. OCWD, Workshop #3: Distribution of Poseidon Resources Ocean Desalinated Water (Jul. 6, 2016).

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

groundwater quality. Those mitigation measures, however, are likely to impact the design and operation of technology and facilities comprising the Outfall/Intake Components, including those facilities relied upon to collect seawater through the intake for desalination, the treatment process used to create Product Water, and the facilities relied upon to discharge the more concentrated brine produced by enhanced TDS treatment through the outfall.

A3-6
cont.

5. CEQA requires preparation of a new or subsequent EIR to address newly available information of substantial importance to the Desal Project that was not known and could not have been known at the time with the exercise of reasonable diligence seven years ago when the 2010 FSEIR was certified. For example, the Municipal Water District of Orange County's (MWDOC) *Executive Report: Orange County Water Reliability Study* (Dec. 2016)⁵ establishes that water supply reliability is achievable through the year 2040 in supply stressed conditions with implementation of reasonably foreseeable, planned projects and programs by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWDSC) and its member agencies, in combination with implementation by Orange County water agencies of a cost effective portfolio of projects and programs *other than* the Desal Project. This information calls into question, and requires a subsequent EIR to:

A3-7

- reevaluate the 2010 FSEIR project purpose and objectives as carried forward in the DSEIR; and
- provide the CEQA review required by law to support the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) analysis of "identified need for desalinated water" as required by the May 2015 State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) amendment (Desal Amendment) to the Statewide Water Quality Control Plan for the Ocean Waters of California (Ocean Plan) addressing desalination facility intakes and brine discharges, and incorporating other non-substantive changes to the Ocean Plan.

6. CEQA requires preparation of a new or subsequent EIR to identify and evaluate an updated reasonable range of alternatives in light of project changes associated with the Current Desal Project and refinements to the project purpose and objectives set forth in the 2010 FSEIR. New information now exists regarding potentially reasonable alternatives to the Current Desal Project, which are likely to reduce significant adverse impacts associated with that project, including the Orange County Basin Optimization Program described in IRWD's *Reliability Alternatives Report* (2015),⁶ and a significant number of projects described in MWDSC's *Integrated*

A3-8

⁵ MWDOC, Orange County Water Reliability Study (Dec. 2016), p. 4-1, available at http://www.mwdoc.com/Uploads/OC%20Study%20Executive%20Report_with%20Appendices_1-4-2017%20FINAL%20Low%20Resolution.pdf

⁶ IRWD, Improving Orange County Water Reliability: Comparing Alternatives (Aug. 2015) available at <http://www.irwd.com/images/pdf/about-us/public-policy/20150826%20Desal%20Project%202-pager.pdf>

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Water Resources Plan 2015 Update,⁷ and the Orange County Water District (OCWD) *Long-Term Facilities Plan 2014 Update*.⁸ Further, many alternatives that were rejected in the FSEIR should be reevaluated based on new information because they may comply with the Desal Project's refined purpose and objectives and the RWQCB's assessment of the need for desalinated water now required by the Desal Amendment and are likely to reduce significant adverse impacts associated with the Current Desal Project. These alternatives include Alternative Site, Alternative Ownership and Operation, Alternative Facility Configuration, and Reduced Facility Size previously rejected by the FSEIR and excluded from consideration in the DSEIR.

A3-8
cont.

B. The DSEIR is Inadequate under CEQA for Review of the Outfall/Intake Components.

A3-9

The DSEIR is also inadequate under CEQA for even the narrow purposes of the CSLC's focused review and approval of the proposed Outfall/Intake Components. The DSEIR violates CEQA even for its focused purpose because it:

1. The DSEIR defines impermissibly narrow project objectives, even for the limited project consisting of the Outfall/Intake Components;
2. The DSEIR fails to consider a reasonable range of alternatives, even for the limited project consisting of Outfall/Intake Components; and
3. The DSEIR fails to identify the Recharge Distribution Components as a reasonably foreseeable future project for purposes of analyzing the cumulative impacts of its approval of the Outfall/Intake Components. This error is prejudicial because the adverse environmental impacts of implementing the 2010 Desal Project, including the Outfall/Intake Components, when considered together with the potential adverse environmental impacts of the Recharge Distribution Components, are reasonably likely to result in cumulatively considerable ground and surface water quality and water supply impacts, which the DSEIR failed to disclose. Consequently, at a minimum, an adequate cumulative impacts assessment must be developed for the DSEIR, and the DSEIR must be recirculated for public review and comment to remedy the error.

A3-10

A3-11

A3-12

⁷ MWDSC, Integrated Water Resources Plan 2015 Update, Report No. 1518 (Jan. 2016), p. 4.4, available to
[http://www.mwdh20.com/PDF_About_Your_Water/2015%20IRP%20Update%20Report%20\(web\).pdf](http://www.mwdh20.com/PDF_About_Your_Water/2015%20IRP%20Update%20Report%20(web).pdf)

⁸ OCWD, Long-Term Facilities Plan 2014 Update (Nov. 4, 2014), p. 3-20, available at
<http://www.ocwd.com/media/3308/long-term-facilities-plan-2014-update.pdf>

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)**II. IRWD'S INTERESTS AND DESAL PROJECT BACKGROUND.**

A3-13

A. IRWD's Interests in High Quality and Reliable Water Supplies.

IRWD is the largest retail water district in Orange County. IRWD's service area includes the City of Irvine and portions of the cities of Tustin, Newport Beach, Costa Mesa, Orange and Lake Forest along with unincorporated areas of Orange County. IRWD's diverse water supply portfolio relies primarily on local groundwater and recycled water, but also includes imported water supplied by MWDSC. Nearly 60 percent of IRWD's total water supply comes from local groundwater wells in the Basin, as well as wells in the Irvine and Lake Forest sub-basins.

To reliably serve a daytime population of more than one-half million, IRWD has planned, designed, constructed, and operates numerous state-of-the-art, conventional, and advanced water treatment, sewage treatment, and water recycling facilities. IRWD has a vested interest in California's water supply reliability and in the implementation of local water supply reliability projects. IRWD operates multiple facilities to produce drinking water, employing technologies such as microfiltration, nanofiltration, reverse osmosis membrane filtration, ultraviolet systems, and other advanced processes, to provide high quality, safe, and highly reliable potable water supplies for its customers.

IRWD's recycled water system is one of the largest in the nation and is used to meet nearly one-third of the total water demand within IRWD's service area. This recycled water system provides an exceptionally reliable and high-quality, non-potable water supply that is used for irrigation, industrial processes, and toilet flushing in more than 80 commercial buildings. Consistent with SWRCB policy,⁹ the use of recycled water is a key component of IRWD's conservation and water use efficiency programs. The use of recycled water extends IRWD's drinking water supplies; reduces the need for additional potable water facilities; reduces the amount of treated wastewater discharged into the ocean; increases water supply reliability; and reduces reliance on more costly sources of water, including imported and desalinated supplies. As part of IRWD's water recycling program, sewage from the community is collected and treated to tertiary standards at both IRWD's MWRP located in Irvine, and the Los Alisos Water Recycling Plant located in Lake Forest. Once treated, recycled water is delivered throughout IRWD's service area through an extensive recycled water distribution system, which is separate from and supplements IRWD's potable water supply and sanitary sewer conveyance systems.

As a leader in water supply reliability planning, IRWD has implemented innovative reliability projects, such as IRWD's groundwater water banking projects in Kern County that are operated in conjunction with innovative water exchange and transfers programs. These projects and programs have been implemented with the objective of IRWD being 100 percent reliable, even under the most severe drought conditions and during major water supply interruptions.

⁹ SWRCB, *Policy for Water Quality Control for Recycled Water*, Resolution No. 2013-0003 (2013).

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

B. Project Background.

1. The City of Huntington Beach's 2010 FSEIR.

In 2005, the City, acting as the designated CEQA "lead agency," certified a Final Recirculated Environmental Impact Report (2005 REIR) that evaluated the proposed desalination plant as a "co-located" facility at the existing AES Huntington Beach Generating Station (HBGS). 2010 FSEIR, Fig. 1-3. In 2010, the City certified the 2010 FSEIR, which replaced the 2005 REIR, based on "changes to the project and circumstances surrounding the project [that] have occurred, and new [] information [that] has become available." *Id.* at p. 1-1. The 2010 FSEIR evaluates both a co-located desalination plant and a "stand-alone" facility that would continue drawing cooling water through the power plant's open ocean intake system after the power plant stopped using the ocean intake system. *Id.*, Fig. 1-3. The 2010 FSEIR's project description defines the 2010 Desal Project as including the construction and operation of those desalination plant facilities necessary to desalinate seawater, and the facilities and infrastructure necessary to distribute Product Water to Orange County water purveyors. The 2010 Desal Project defined the project as:

- Construction and operation of a 50 million gallon per day (MGD) Desal Plant; and
- Construction and operation of off-site improvements and infrastructure necessary to deliver Product Water via direct surface distribution to Orange County retail water purveyors, including a new water delivery pipeline, underground booster pump stations, and modifications to an existing booster pump station (collectively, the "Surface/Potable Distribution System").

Id. at p. 3-1.

In 2010, and based on the 2010 FSEIR, the CSLC approved the Applicant's request to amend General Lease – Industrial Use PRC 1980.1, allowing the Applicant to use the AES HBGS seawater intake and discharge pipelines for 2010 Desal Project operations. The City takes the position that it lacks continuing jurisdiction over further environmental review of the Current Desal Project because it has no further discretionary approvals to issue.

2. Changes to the 2010 Desal Project Since the 2010 FSEIR.

(a) Introduction of the Recharge Distribution Components.

On May 14, 2015, the Orange County Water District (OCWD) Board of Directors approved a term sheet setting forth preliminary and non-binding terms for future negotiations of a possible contract for OCWD to purchase 56,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) of Product Water from the Applicant for distribution to Orange County water retailers and for OCWD to construct and operate the necessary infrastructure to take, store, and deliver Product Water (Term

A3-14

A3-15

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Sheet). *Term Sheet Water Reliability Agreement: Huntington Beach Seawater Desalination Project* (Term Sheet) (May 2015).¹⁰

A3-15
cont.

Pursuant to the Term Sheet, OCWD has undertaken planning and conceptual design of the Recharge Distribution Components of the Current Desal Project, including but not limited to directly injecting and recharging desalinated water into the Basin,¹¹ then distributing Product Water blended with groundwater to Orange County retail water supply agencies (Direct Recharge Distribution) via the 100% Recharge related infrastructure of Option 1A encompassed within Option 6, and all associated injection wells, pump stations, associated pipelines, and other facilities. OCWD, *Workshop #3: Distribution of Poseidon Resources Ocean Desalinated Water* (Jul. 6, 2016).¹²

In July 2016, the OCWD Board of Directors authorized staff to proceed with — and OCWD staff is currently advancing with — the study, planning, and design of the Recharge Distribution Components for the Current Desal Project; however, no CEQA review of the environmental issues relating to OCWD's recharge and distribution of the Product Water has been performed. The 2010 FSEIR only evaluated the Surface/Potable Distribution System, and no evaluation of the Recharge Distribution Components has been undertaken. In 2016, the OCWD Board of Directors further directed staff to seek commitments from other Orange County retail water agencies to purchase Product Water, but OCWD has not sufficiently reviewed the potential adverse environmental impacts of delivering Product Water to those agencies pursuant to CEQA.

(b) The Orange County Water Reliability Study.

In December 2016, MWDOC published its *Executive Report: Orange County Water Reliability Study* (OC Study). The OC Study comprehensively evaluates current and future water supply and system reliability for Orange County through the year 2040, and makes statewide, regional, and local recommendations for purposes of advancing water reliability for Orange County as a whole. *Id.* at p. 4-1 through 4-3. The OC Study concludes that there are multiple paths to achieving water supply reliability without the Desal Project.

A3-16

¹⁰ Term Sheet Water Reliability Agreement: Huntington Beach Seawater Desalination Project (May 2015), available at <http://www.irwd.com/images/pdf/about-us/Desalination/Revised%20Poseidon%20Term%20Sheet%20May%202015.pdf>.

¹¹ The Orange County Groundwater Basin is the largest groundwater source in Orange County, serving almost 78 percent of the County's total population. The Basin is managed by OCWD, which manages use of the groundwater and recharge of the Basin via the natural, imported, and treated sources of water to which it has access. To augment groundwater recharge, OCWD operates its state-of-the-art Groundwater Replenishment System (GWRS) that purifies wastewater and reintroduces it into the Basin as a saltwater intrusion barrier and to augment water supplies. To supplement recharge and the overall potable water supply, 28 water providers and OCWD purchase water from MWDOC, which, in turn, purchases water from MWDSC. MWDOC, *Orange County Water Reliability Study* (Dec. 2016) p. 1-2.

¹² OCWD, *Workshop #3: Distribution of Poseidon Resources Ocean Desalinated Water* (Jul. 6, 2016), available at http://www.irwd.com/images/pdf/about-us/Desalination/OCWD_Board_Minutes_7-6-2016_Approving_Option6.pdf

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

In December 2014, MWDOC convened the Orange County Workgroup (the “OC Workgroup”), made up of managers from MWDOC, MWDOC member agencies, OCWD, and the cities of Anaheim, Fullerton, and Santa Ana, and initiated the *OC Study* to comprehensively evaluate current and future water supply and system reliability for all of Orange County. The OC Workgroup met over 25 times, provided key direction and guidance for the *OC Study*, agreed to key assumptions, and reviewed all findings of the *OC Study*. The *OC Study* examined supply and system reliability for three specific areas of the county: Brea/La Habra, Orange County Basin, and South Orange County. *Id.* at p. 1-3.

The *OC Study* evaluates three planning scenarios (Planned Conditions, Moderately Stressed Conditions, and Significantly Stressed Conditions) defined by differing assumptions that the OC Workgroup deemed reasonable, taking into consideration local water supplies, water demands, climate change impacts, and base flows that recharge the Basin. *Id.* at p. 2-6. The OC Workgroup determined that the Moderately Stressed Conditions scenario, without the California WaterFix, called Scenario 2a, was the appropriate baseline for the *OC Study*. *Id.* at p. 2-11.

The OC Workgroup identified a suite of regional water supply projects that would likely be implemented in response to the shortages identified for the baseline. *Id.* at p. 3-1. These regional water supply projects were grouped into regional portfolios of projects that are expected to be implemented by MWDSC and its member agencies (regional Portfolio B) and evaluated for effectiveness in offsetting the shortages identified in Scenario 2a included the following:

- Expanded MWDSC/Palo Verde Irrigation District Programs;
- Other Colorado River Programs and Transfers;
- Central Valley Water District Transfers;
- Carson Indirect Potable Reuse Project;
- City of San Diego Pure Water Program;
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Groundwater Replenishment Project;
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Groundwater Remediation Project;
- Eastern Municipal Water District Indirect Potable Reuse Project; and
- Other MWDSC member agency projects in design or in advance planning stages.

Id. at p. 3-5 and 3-6.

The *OC Study* concluded with respect to the Brea/La Habra and Basin areas that “remaining shortages after implementing MWDSC regional Portfolio B would be small enough to manage by enhanced groundwater management or additional conservation.” *Id.* at p. 3-6. With respect to the South Orange County area, the *OC Study* documented several illustrative South

A3-16
cont.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Orange County portfolios to show that there are multiple cost effective projects and programs in which both the supply and system reliability needs of South Orange County can be met. *Id.* at p. 3-8. Of importance to the CSLC, the *OC Study* concluded that, even if the WaterFix is not implemented, there are multiple paths to achieving water supply reliability at the MWDSC regional level without the Desal Project. See *id.* at p. 4-1.

A3-16
cont.**3. The CSLC's DSEIR for the Outfall/Intake Components.**

A3-17

The Applicant is now seeking the following agency approvals:

- CSLC approval for the Outfall/Intake Components;
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) determination that the Current Desal Project complies with Water Code section 13142.5(b);
- California Coastal Commission (CCC) approval of a coastal development permit; and
- OCWD approval of the purchase and distribution of Product Water.

On May 26, 2017, the CSLC published the DSEIR for public comment. The DSEIR is a focused document that addresses only the Outfall/Intake Components of the Current Desal Project on the legally flawed theory that the scope of the DSEIR need only be commensurate with CSLC's jurisdiction and approval authority. DSEIR, pp. 1-17 – 1-18. Specifically, the DSEIR states its reasoning as: "The Supplemental EIR is intended to provide the Commission with information required to exercise its jurisdictional responsibilities with respect to the Lease Modification Project [Outfall/Intake Components]" DSEIR, p. ES-3. Although it may be expedient to narrowly focus the DSEIR on the Outfall/Intake Components such an approach does not comply with CEQA, and its prohibitions against basing environmental analysis on a stale and outdated project description; it improperly piecemeals the project components rather than analyzing the full project and its reasonably foreseeable impacts. See CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15121, 15328. The DSEIR attempts to remedy these CEQA violations by incorporating by reference the City's 2010 FSEIR but it fails because the project description in the 2010 FSEIR describes the 2010 Desal Project – and not the full extent of the Current Desal Project. See DSEIR, p. 1-17 ("the CSLC is evaluating the incremental effects associated with the proposed Lease Modification Project [Outfall/Intake Components] when evaluating whether such modifications to the approved 2010 Project would result in any significant environmental impacts"). The DSEIR also does not analyze the potential environmental impacts of the Outfall/Intake Components in the context and as a part of, the Current Desal Project, rendering the DSEIR's project description additionally flawed.

4. The Desal Amendment to the Ocean Plan.

A3-18

After certification of the 2010 FSEIR, the SWRCB adopted the Desal Amendment to the Ocean Plan in May 2015. Among other things, the Desal Amendment created new section III.M of the Ocean Plan governing implementation provisions for desalination facilities. Pursuant to the Desal Amendment, regional water quality control boards must conduct analysis under

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Water Code section 13142.5(b) in accordance with the requirements of the Desal Amendment to make “feasibility determinations” regarding desalination facility sites, designs, technologies, and mitigation measures. Further, regional water quality control boards must analyze and make feasibility determinations in consultation with the CSLC, CCC, and other state agencies, regarding the following factors (among others):

A3-18
cont.

- Whether the identified need for desalinated water is consistent with regional and local water planning documents, such as the *OC Study*; and
- The lowest impact design, layout, form and function of desalination project infrastructure.

Desal Amendment §§ III.M.2.b(2), d.

As stated in the DSEIR, the RWQCB has notified the Applicant that it is necessary for the Applicant to submit the information required by the Desal Amendment, and for the RWQCB to conduct the analysis of the Current Desal Project required by the Desal Amendment to make feasibility determinations. DSEIR, p. 1-8. As further acknowledged in the DSEIR, the RWQCB must have sufficient “CEQA documentation or CEQA functional equivalent analysis” to conduct the feasibility analysis determinations required by the Desal Amendment and Water Code section 13142.5(b). DSEIR, p. 1-8.

III. THE DSEIR IS AN IMPROPER SUPPLEMENT BECAUSE NO COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT DESAL PROJECT IN ITS ENTIRETY EXISTS.

A3-19

A. The CSLC is Responsible for Preparing a Comprehensive Update to the 2010 FSEIR.

The City takes the position that it has no further discretionary approvals to grant to the Desal Project, therefore, it has no further duties as the lead agency. Nevertheless, it is clear that other agencies must issue further discretionary approvals for the Desal Project to move forward. In addition to seeking the approval of the Outfall/Intake Components from the CSLC, the Applicant is also seeking permits/approvals from other CEQA responsible agencies, including both the RWQCB and CCC.

The *Interagency Permit Sequencing Framework Agreement* (Permitting Agreement)¹³ by and among the CSLC, RWQCB, and CCC provides that:

[I]n developing its draft Tentative Order [the RWQCB] can rely on the [2010 FSEIR] in combination with CEQA analysis prepared and approved by the State Lands Commission in its evaluation of [the Applicant's] proposed seawater intake and discharge technology modifications for the purposes of complying with CEQA.

¹³ Interagency Permit Sequencing Framework Agreement (Oct. 2016) available at <http://www.slc.ca.gov/Info/Reports/Seawater/B.pdf>

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Permitting Agreement, p. 2. As a matter of law, the CSLC, RWQCB, and other CEQA responsible and trustee agencies must evaluate the impacts of issuing their discretionary permits and approvals under CEQA based on a current, accurate, and comprehensive description of: (1) the Current Desal Project with all changes, modifications and/or new components; (2) currently relevant information and circumstances; and (3) currently available and feasible mitigation measures. Pub. Resources Code § 21166; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15121, 15378. Therefore, to proceed in compliance with the Permitting Agreement and the requirements of CEQA, it is incumbent upon the CSLC to prepare a new or subsequent EIR that provides sufficient support for its own actions, and those of other CEQA responsible and trustee agencies, and that includes a thorough impacts analysis of new and substantially more severe environmental effects of the Current Desal Project.

CEQA provides that, where a responsible agency is called on to grant a discretionary approval for a project subject to CEQA for which another public agency was the appropriate lead agency, the responsible agency shall assume the role of the lead agency where:

“(2) The lead agency prepared environmental documents for the project, but the following conditions occur:

- (A) A subsequent EIR is required pursuant to Section 15162,
- (B) The lead agency has granted a final approval for the project, and
- (C) The statute of limitations for challenging the lead agency's action under CEQA has expired.”

CEQA Guidelines, § 15052(a). Here, major changes to the 2010 Desal Project, significant new information, and changed circumstances necessitate a subsequent EIR. The assumption of the lead agency's role falls to the next responsible agency to issue a discretionary approval. In this case, the next responsible agency is the CSLC, and as such is required to prepare a new or subsequent EIR that addresses all new and changed components of the project description, including the Recharge Distribution Components, the attendant impacts to groundwater and recycled water quality, and the feasible alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce impacts. CEQA Guidelines, § 15162. No responsible agency – CSLC, RWQCB, or CCC – may grant an approval for the project until the CSLC prepares a new or supplemental EIR with a current, accurate, and complete project description. A complete and accurate project description is “the *sine qua non* of an informative and legally sufficient EIR.” See *Mira Monte Homeowners Assn. v. County of Ventura* (1985) 165 Cal.App.3d 357, 365 (internal citations omitted).

IRWD recognizes that under the Term Sheet, it was and is anticipated that OCWD would prepare and complete a subsequent EIR for the delivery and distribution system components of the Desal Project. See Term Sheet, p. 6. However, OCWD has not prepared a subsequent EIR – or any CEQA document. Further, OCWD's ongoing planning is for an entirely different distribution and delivery system project component than that analyzed as a part of the 2010 Desal Project in the 2010 FSEIR. See DSEIR, p. 1-11 – 1-12 (OCWD declines to prepare an EIR). As a result, the burden to prepare the subsequent EIR falls upon the CSLC. See CEQA Guidelines, § 15052(a).

A3-19
cont.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

B. Substantial Changes to the 2010 Desal Project Require a New or Subsequent EIR.

A3-20

The 2010 FSEIR cannot be made current with minor modifications via preparation of either an addendum or a supplemental EIR because changes to the 2010 Desal Project and significant new information and circumstances require major rather than minor revisions to the 2010 FSEIR. These revisions include a project description that includes the Recharge Distribution Components and an attendant environmental impacts analysis, updated purpose and objectives based on the new supply reliability information in the OC Study, and feasible alternatives and mitigation measures to reduce the Current Desal Project's significant effects. See CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15162, 15163(a), (b). When an EIR already exists and major revisions are required in order to bring the EIR up to date, a subsequent EIR is required.

When one or more further discretionary approvals is required by a lead or responsible agency for a project for which an EIR has already been certified or adopted, the agency must determine whether additional CEQA review is required. Pub. Resources Code, § 21166. Such new CEQA review may, in appropriate cases, consist of either a supplemental or a subsequent EIR. The difference between a subsequent EIR and a supplemental EIR involves the level of changes needed to update the existing EIR to fully and adequately analyze the project in its entirety, as it has changed. CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15162, 15163(a). Specifically,

- A subsequent EIR is required when substantial changes proposed in the project resulting in "new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects" will require major revisions of the EIR.
- A supplemental EIR is appropriate only when the EIR that is relied upon addresses **the same project** to be considered in the supplemental EIR with minor modifications.

Pub. Resources Code, § 21166(a); CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15162(a)(1), 15163(a), (b); see *City of San Jose v. Great Oaks Water Co.* (1987) 192 Cal.App.3d 1005, 1016 (supplemental EIR consists of "[only] *minor additions or changes* . . . necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation []" and must be considered in conjunction with the previous EIR) (emphasis added).

Here, no EIR exists that includes a current, accurate, and complete project description on which a supplemental EIR can rely, due to major changes to the 2010 Desal Project that have occurred since certification of the 2010 FSEIR. The DSEIR, which addresses only the proposed Outfall/Intake Components combined with the outdated 2010 FSEIR, is not a sufficient basis upon which the CSLC can approve the proposed Outfall/Intake Components because this improperly segregates the Outfall/Intake Components of the overall project. In fact, the focused Outfall/Intake Components project actually modifies Current Desal Project, which, to date, has not been properly reviewed pursuant to CEQA. The Current Desal Project, which includes the Recharge Distribution Components as well as the Outfall/Intake Components, has (as documented below in Sections III.C.2 and III.C.3) new and substantially more severe impacts than previously analyzed, necessitating a comprehensive update to the 2010 FSEIR via a new or subsequent EIR. See CEQA Guidelines, § 15162 (requiring a subsequent EIR when

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

"important revisions of the previous EIR . . . due to the involvement of new significant environmental impacts" that were not previously considered are needed).

A3-20
cont.

Absent a new or subsequent EIR that analyzes the Current Desal Project -- as changed since certification of the 2010 FSEIR -- and its impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures, the CSLC's CEQA document is an improper supplement that fails to analyze the environmental impacts of implementing the Outfall/Intake Components of the Current Desal Project in contravention of the CEQA Guidelines. The DSEIR therefore fails to fulfill its essential role as an informational document, and is thus not "sufficient to allow informed decision making" by the CSLC, or by the RWQCB or CCC. See *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 402-403 (holding that the failure to provide a full and meaningful discussion of impacts and alternatives renders an EIR inadequate under CEQA). Consequently, the CSLC is required to prepare a comprehensive new or subsequent EIR to update the 2010 FSEIR, including a thorough impacts analysis of the new and substantially more severe environmental effects of the Current Desal Project, in addition to a focused analysis of Current Desal Project components within its jurisdiction (i.e., the Outfall/Intake Components).

C. Desal Project Changes Must be Comprehensively – and Not in a Piecemealed Fashion – Reviewed in a Subsequent EIR.

A3-21

The DSEIR improperly relies on the now stale, inaccurate 2010 FSEIR as its basis. No accurate project description of the entire Current Desal Project, as planned in 2017, is available, nor is a comprehensive evaluation of the Current Desal Project's environmental impacts, feasible alternatives, or feasible mitigation measures available for the DSEIR to supplement. Furthermore, by seeking environmental review and approval of only the Outfall/Intake Components -- one of many changes made to the 2010 Desal Project -- from a responsible agency (the CSLC), rather than seeking comprehensive environmental review of the entire Current Desal Project from the CSLC, OCWD (based on the Term Sheet) or another lead agency, the Applicant is cleverly avoiding comprehensive CEQA review and the need to consider new feasible alternatives and mitigation measures. A limited environmental review was chosen despite the fact that new feasible alternatives and mitigation measures not considered for the original 2010 Desal Project may be appropriate for the Current Desal Project. Allowing the Applicant to serially seek focused review and approval by responsible agencies, such as the CSLC, with each review focusing only on those specific 2010 Desal Project components within the responsible agency's jurisdiction, would lead to the approval of the Desal Project without appropriate CEQA review. This method is ultimately likely to lead to the Current Desal Project's full approval and permitting without full consideration of the degree to which the Current Desal Project, in its entirety (including the introduction of the Recharge Distribution Components or the significant new information and circumstances developed over the last seven years since certification of the 2010 FSEIR), results in new adverse environmental impacts, or requires implementation of new or different alternatives and mitigation measures to avoid and reduce impacts to the fullest extent feasible.

Segmentation or "piecemealing" the environmental review of the Current Desal Project violates CEQA. CEQA Guidelines, § 15378 (EIR must evaluate the "whole of the action"). The purpose of the piecemealing prohibition is to prevent segmented review focused on only certain project components resulting in: (1) a failure to identify the severity of adverse impacts of the

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

entire project as planned; (2) a failure to identify and consider a reasonable range of alternatives to avoid or reduce impacts of the *entire project as planned*; and (3) a failure to consider and prescribe all feasible and available mitigation measures to reduce adverse impacts of *the entire project as planned*. See, e.g., *Christward Ministry v. Superior Court* (1986) 184 Cal.App.3d 180, 195–96 (city impermissibly chopped up single project into three separate projects, which was “exactly the type of piecemeal environmental review prohibited by CEQA”).

A3-21
cont.

To fulfill the purposes of and comply with CEQA, the Applicant cannot be allowed to piecemeal the CEQA review of the Current Desal Project by improperly failing to prepare a subsequent EIR when one is required to evaluate the project *in its entirety*. Moreover, the Applicant cannot be allowed to further segment environmental review of the many, various updated components of the Desal Project among a variety of different CEQA responsible agencies, including the CSLC, RWQCB and CCC, while OCWD fails to initiate a full subsequent EIR necessary to review environmental impacts associated with the Current Desal Project, including its delivery and distribution system components, as they have changed since certification of the 2010 FSEIR. See n. 10, *supra*, Term Sheet, pp. 3, 6. The following discussion highlights the differences between the 2010 FSEIR Desal Project and the Current Desal Project, which requires a comprehensive, updated subsequent EIR; the environmental review of which cannot and should not be piecemealed.

1. The Project Description in the 2010 FSEIR and “Supplemented” by the DSEIR is Inaccurate and Incomplete in 2017.

A3-22

The DSEIR purports to provide supplemental environmental evaluation of changes to the 2010 Desal Project associated with the Outfall/Intake Components as if those changes were being proposed to the 2010 Desal Project as defined in the 2010 FSEIR, rather than as a part of the Current Desal Project. The 2010 FSEIR project description does not include or anticipate replacement of the 2010 Desal Project’s delivery and distribution components with the Recharge Distribution Components approved by OCWD in 2016 for planning, conceptual design and, in the future, further environmental review. More specifically, Section 3.5 of the 2010 FSEIR specifies that the 2010 Desal Project would deliver Product Water via the Surface/Potable Water Distribution System consisting of off-site pipelines connecting to the existing OC-44 water transmission line in three locations including the Newport Beach Reach B and the East Orange feeder .

Contrary to the 2010 FSEIR’s project description, the Recharge Distribution Components (identified by OCWD as Option 6) would require as many as 26 new injection wells in various Basin locations, a pump station, a different pipeline route, and associated infrastructure necessary to inject, store, recover, and deliver groundwater recharged with Product Water. *Workshop #3: Distribution of Poseidon Resources Ocean Desalinated Water, supra*.¹⁴ These facilities, which comprise the Recharge Distribution Components, represent significant changes to the 2010 Desal Project’s Surface/Potable Distribution System evaluated in the 2010 FSEIR; however, the adverse impacts of those components have not been identified or evaluated, nor have potentially feasible alternatives or mitigation measures to reduce those impacts, which

¹⁴ See footnote 12, *supra*.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

may reasonably affect project design features of the Current Desal Project, including the Outfall/Intake Components, been studied in in the DSEIR.

These changes to the 2010 Desal Project, which have already been approved by OCWD for inclusion in one form or another as a part of the Current Desal Project, substantially and materially change the environmental impacts of the Current Desal Project as discussed in more detail below. The failure to acknowledge the substitution of the Recharge Distribution Components in place of the 2010 Desal Project's Surface/Potable Distribution System is also anticipated to directly affect the reliability of the DSEIR's environmental evaluation of the Outfall/Intake Components. Nevertheless, these changes to the 2010 Desal Project are not taken into account in the DSEIR's evaluation because the DSEIR relies on the outdated 2010 FSEIR project description rather than preparing and evaluating an updated project description that accurately reflects the Current Desal Project.

"An accurate, stable and finite project description is the *sine qua non* of an informative and legally sufficient EIR. The defined project and not some different project must be the EIR's bona fide subject." *Mira Monte Homeowners Assn. v. County of Ventura*, *supra* (internal citations omitted). CEQA Guidelines section 15378(a) defines the term "Project" as "the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in a physical change in the environment, directly or ultimately," and which is undertaken, supported or approved by a public agency. Subdivision (c) of this section states, "[t]he term 'project' refers to the activity which is being approved and which may be subject to several discretionary approvals by governmental agencies. The term 'project' does not mean each separate governmental approval." For example, in *Santiago County Water Dist. v. County of Orange* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 818, the Court held an EIR was inadequate because it failed to include a description of the facilities that would have to be constructed to deliver water to a proposed mining operation. *Id.* at pp. 829-30. The Court noted:

"The construction of additional water delivery facilities is undoubtedly one of the significant environmental effects of the project. As such, a description of the necessary construction had to be included if the EIR was to serve its informational purpose. [Citations.] Because of this omission, some important ramifications of the proposed project remained hidden from view at the time the project was being discussed and approved. This frustrates one of the core goals of CEQA."

Ibid.

All EIRs must evaluate the "whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment." CEQA Guidelines, § 15378. "From this principle, 'it is clear that the requirements of CEQA 'cannot be avoided by chopping up proposed projects into bite-sized pieces' which, when taken individually, may have no significant adverse effect on the environment." *Assn. for a Cleaner Environment v. Yosemite Cmty. Coll. Dist.* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 629, 638 (project to close shooting range included cleanup and dismantling); see also *Citizens Assn. for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo* (1985) 172 Cal.App.3d 151, 165 (project improperly segmented into two projects for CEQA purposes). The task of additional environmental review cannot be segmented into the individual project

A3-22
cont.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

components among the different agencies that are responsible for approval. *See generally, Banning Ranch Conservancy v. City of Newport Beach* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 918 (CEQA requires EIRs to take a comprehensive view and coordinate their analysis with the planning and environmental review processes of other responsible agencies).

A3-22
cont.

As noted, the Current Desal Project includes the Recharge Distribution Components, which replace the Surface/Potable Delivery System, and were not previously evaluated as part of the 2010 Desal Project. In fact, the 2010 FSEIR only briefly discusses the Surface/Potable Delivery System. 2010 FSEIR, p. 3-72 – 3-73. It is entirely clear that the 2010 FSEIR does not contemplate the Recharge Distribution Component or any alternative that would directly or indirectly recharge or replenish the Basin, with Product Water because the 2010 FSEIR incorrectly concludes, without analysis, that: Use of desalinated seawater from the [2010 Desal Project] will not affect any groundwater basin water quality objectives via groundwater spreading, conjunctive use, or the use of recycled water in Orange County.” 2010 FSEIR, p. 4.11-5.

As a result, the DSEIR’s project description precludes environmental analysis of a fully and accurately described project by the CSLC. In addition, the 2010 Desal Project description, relied upon by the DSEIR, is insufficient because it does not take into account the end use(s) of Product Water. Taking the end use(s) of Product Water into consideration as a part of the DSEIR’s project description is critical to effective analysis of potential significant impacts associated with the Desal Project and all of its components. For example, an evaluation of the end use(s) of the desalinated water is necessary to determine:

A3-23

- Acceptable target concentrations of boron, TDS, and salts for Product Water, which in turn drive treatment facilities that must be included in the design of the Desal Project and any associated modifications to the use and design of Outfall/Intake Components, and
- Blending water requirements for Product Water, which in turn drive facilities related to providing source water for blending that must be included in the design of the Desal Project and any associated modifications to the use and design of Outfall/Intake Components.

Identification of all project design features of the Current Desal Project that are necessary for enhanced treatment of boron, TDS, and salts and for delivery of blending source water, and evaluation of the relationship between those project design features and the Outfall/Intake Components, is required for an accurate evaluation of adverse impacts of, and appropriate mitigation for, both the Current Desal Project as a whole, and of the discrete Outfall/Intake Components of the Current Desal Project. (Trussell Technologies, Inc., Technical Memorandum: Review of the Proposed Water Quality Requirements for the Huntington Beach Desalter, Apr. 13, 2016, pp. 74-75.)¹⁵

¹⁵ Trussell Technologies, Inc., *Review of Proposed Water Quality Requirements for the Huntington Beach Desalter* (Apr. 13, 2016), available at <http://www.irwd.com/images/pdf/about-us/Desalination/Trussell%20Tech%20Final%20Report%20for%20OCWD%2020160413.pdf>.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Similarly, while it may have been appropriate to use drinking water standards to set TDS limits for the Surface/Potable Distribution component of the 2010 Desal Project in the 2010 FSEIR, when the Product Water (with TDS concentrations of 350 mg/l to 500 mg/l as described in the Term Sheet) will be used to recharge groundwater that is of better quality (currently about 270 mg/l in the vicinity of IRWD wells), it is essential to set lower TDS limits for Product Water so as not to degrade baseline groundwater quality in the Basin.¹⁶ Different TDS limits may affect the design and use of technology and facilities relied upon to:

- collection of seawater through the intake for desalination;
- treatment of seawater to create Product Water; and
- discharge treatment effluent with higher concentrations of pollutants (brine) through the outfall and back to the ocean.

The conditions, technologies, and treatment processes involved in the desalination process that must be incorporated into the Desal Plant to accommodate the new Recharge Distribution Components are all a part of the Current Desal Project. Without a description of these project components, the DSEIR project description is inaccurate and incomplete and consequently impossible to evaluate from an environmental compliance perspective. See *San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Center v. County of Stanislaus* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 713, 734 (holding that failure to consider the expansion of the wastewater treatment plant as part of the project under consideration resulted in an inaccurate project description and incomplete identification and analysis of the environmental effects). In addition, failure to identify end use omits a discussion of the impacts associated with Current Desal Project infrastructure needed to deliver, store, and distribute Product Water. MWDSC, *Integrated Water Resources Plan 2015 Update* (hereinafter, “2015 IRP”),¹⁷ 2015, p. 44 (“[F]actors affecting [desalinated seawater] cost include the types of processes needed to meet water quality goals as well as the length of pipeline and pumping requirements for integrating desalinated seawater into the distribution system.”)¹⁸

The construction and interrelated operation of the Outfall/Intake Components, Desal Plant design features, and Recharge Distribution system design features (including recharge facilities and the infrastructure needed to recover and distribute water from the ground) are all part of a single project that must be considered together in a comprehensive, updated subsequent EIR. To comply with CEQA, therefore, the CSLC must prepare a new or subsequent EIR for the entire project that covers impacts from all substantial changes to the Desal Project, including changes to aspects of the Desal Project that do not involve the Outfall/Intake Components.

¹⁶ Please note that IRWD does not concede that TDS levels meeting drinking water standards are sufficiently protective even for direct distribution because an elevation in TDS levels in the influent entering the MWRP as compared to influent without Product Water is reasonably likely to adversely affect IRWD’s recycled water program as discussed in Section III.C.3.

¹⁷ See footnote 7 *supra*.

¹⁸ *Id.*

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

The other responsible agencies must also be able to rely on the subsequent EIR for any additional discretionary approvals. In particular, the new facilities comprising the Recharge Distribution Components – the pipeline, the groundwater injection wells, and groundwater production and conveyance facilities – are facilities required to attain the Desal Project purpose and objectives (as described in the 2010 FSEIR and DSEIR), they unquestionably are part of the same project for CEQA purposes. *Tuolumne Cty. Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Sonora* (2007) 155 Cal.App.4th 1214, 1226 (“The relationship between the particular act and the remainder of the project is sufficiently close [to constitute a single project under CEQA] when the proposed physical act is among the “various steps which taken together obtain an objective.”) As such, the CSLC must evaluate these facilities as part of its project description in an updated or new subsequent EIR. *Rural Landowners Assn. v. City Council* (1983) 143 Cal.App.3d 1013, 1024-25 (where the responsible agency stepped into the shoes to prepare a subsequent or supplemental EIR, all parts of project, including new parts, had to be evaluated).

A3-25

2. Impacts Associated with the Construction and Operation of the Recharge Distribution Components Must be Evaluated.

A3-26

The manner in which Product Water is integrated with existing potable water distribution systems can affect the existing distribution systems, project operations, and recycled water systems, and can be a determining factor stranding water supply infrastructure. See 2015 IRP, p. 48. Construction and operation of the facilities comprising the Recharge Distribution Components, including up to 26 new injection wells, was not considered in the 2010 FSEIR or the DSEIR, and such facilities would result in significant new and substantially more severe impacts. Construction-phase effects would include significant ground disturbance with potential biological resource, and cultural/paleontological impacts, and involve the use of heavy equipment with potential air quality impacts. Operations-phase effects of such facilities may include hydrogeologic impacts as well as ground and surface water quality impacts, groundwater mounding impacts, and water supply impacts, as further discussed in Section III.C.3. See *City of San Jose v. Great Oaks Water Co.* (1987) 192 Cal.App.3d 1005 (holding that agency’s failure to prepare additional CEQA analysis when the EIR did not address the impact of three new wells violated CEQA and rendered the agency’s project approval unlawful); *Santiago County Water Dist. v. County of Orange* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 818 (holding EIR on proposed mining operation inadequate because it failed to include a description of the facilities that will have to be constructed to deliver water to mining operation).

3. The Recharge Distribution Components Would Significantly Adversely Affect Water Quality and Water Supply.

A3-27

Water Quality Impacts. The 2010 FSEIR only evaluated the Surface/Potable Distribution System as a part of the 2010 Desal Project. In response to OCWD’s planning and consideration of the Recharge Distribution Components, IRWD has identified multiple potential significant adverse impacts from the Current Desal Project related to water quality. These potential adverse water quality impacts associated with the Recharge Distribution Components include the potential to:

- Degrade high quality groundwater in contravention of the SWRCB Anti-Degradation Policy (Resolution No. 68-16);

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

- Reduce the quality of water delivered to IRWD customers; and
- Encumber IRWD's continued ability to comply with individual National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit standards for discharge of recycled water due to elevated concentrations of TDS in Product Water.

A3-27
cont.

As explained in Section III.C.1, the 2010 FSEIR only analyzed the introduction of Product Water into the potable water system and direct delivery to water supply retailers (i.e., surface/potable distribution). Consequently, the 2010 FSEIR did not evaluate Desal Project impacts to groundwater quality. Instead, the 2010 FSEIR only analyzed Product Water quality impacts vis-à-vis their compliance with regulatory drinking water standards, and not in comparison to Basin groundwater quality objectives or existing groundwater quality conditions. See 2010 FSEIR, § 4.11.

As documented in IRWD preliminary study results that were presented to OCWD by IRWD and its consultants on March 8, 2016, the recharge of Product Water is reasonably likely to significantly degrade the quality of groundwater within the Basin. Thomas Harder & Company; HDR, Inc., *Preliminary Analysis Impact of Desalinated Seawater Use to IRWD's Recycled Water* (IRWD Presentation to OCWD) (Mar. 8, 2016).¹⁹ The 2010 FSEIR predicts that boron is expected to be present in the Product Water at concentrations of approximately 0.6–1.0 mg/L (2010 FSEIR, p. 4.11-13) and the Term Sheet specifies Product Water will have concentrations at levels of 0.75-1.0 mg/L. *Term Sheet Water Reliability Agreement: Huntington Beach Seawater Desalination Project* (Term Sheet) (May 2015,) Att. A.²⁰ These Product Water boron concentrations exceed:

- Current Basin groundwater quality objectives for boron of 0.75 mg/L (RWQCB, Water Quality Control Plan for Santa Ana Basin, Region 8, (Basin Plan), updated Feb. 2016, p. 4-21);²¹ and
- Current concentrations of boron in groundwater pumped from the Basin, which range from .08 mg/l to 0.138 mg/l as measured by IRWD at the Dyer Road Wellfield between September 27, 2016 and April 4, 2016.

In addition, TDS concentrations in the Product Water are anticipated to range from 350 to 500 mg/L (Term Sheet, Att. A), exceeding:

¹⁹ OCWD, *Preliminary Analysis Impact of Desalinated Seawater Use to IRWD's Recycled Water* (Mar. 8, 2016) available at <http://www.irwd.com/images/pdf/about-us/Desalination/Desalination%20Preliminary%20Impact%20Presentation%20March%202016.pdf>

²⁰ Term Sheet, Attachment A (May 2015) available at <http://www.irwd.com/images/pdf/about-us/Desalination/Attachment%20A%20Water%20Reliability%20Agreement%20Term%20Sheet%20May%202015.pdf>

²¹ RWQCB, Water Quality control Plan for Santa Ana Basin, Region 8 (Feb. 2016) available at http://waterboards.ca.gov/santaana/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/2016/Chapter_4_Feb_2016.pdf

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

- Current concentrations of TDS in Basin groundwater in the vicinity of IRWD's well facilities, which are approximately 270 mg/L on an average annual basis as measured by IRWD at the Dyer Road Wellfield in calendar year 2016.

A3-27
cont.

Accordingly, recharging Product Water into the Basin, is reasonably likely to increase the boron and TDS loads, and significantly degrade the existing and future high quality groundwater within the Basin in the proximity of IRWD wells. Such water quality degradation would unreasonably adversely impact the beneficial use of groundwater by increasing the concentration of those pollutants. These groundwater quality impacts must not only be analyzed and mitigated in a properly prepared new or subsequent EIR pursuant to CEQA, but must also be analyzed for violation of the SWRCB Antidegradation Policy (Resolution No. 68-16) and the Basin Plan.

In addition to the potential significant adverse impacts that recharging Product Water will have on boron and TDS concentrations in the groundwater Basin, the recovery and use of the groundwater recharged with Product Water is also likely to significantly and adversely affect the quality of potable water delivered to IRWD customers, which was never evaluated in the 2010 FSEIR or DSEIR. Customer use of the lower quality potable water will result in sewage being delivered to the MWRP that is also higher in boron and TDS concentrations. Higher concentrations of these pollutants in sewage are likely to adversely impact the quality of recycled water produced at the MWRP and distributed through IRWD's recycled water system.

These potential adverse impacts on recycled water production and use were not analyzed in the 2010 FSEIR or the DSEIR but IRWD has contracted with consultants Thomas Harder & Company and HDR, Inc. to preliminarily, and subject to full CEQA review, evaluate and determine the potential for significant adverse impacts of Product Water pollutant concentrations on the quality of recycled water produced for and served to IRWD customers. On March 8, 2016, IRWD's consultants participated with IRWD in presenting to OCWD their preliminary analysis regarding the impact of recharging Product Water on the quality of groundwater and recycled water produced at MWRP. IRWD Presentation to OCWD. The results of this study indicate that the increases in concentrations of boron and TDS in the groundwater that IRWD extracts from the Basin resulting from recharge with Product Water is likely to increase those pollutants in recycled water produced by IRWD. These increased pollutant concentrations in IRWD's recycled water, in turn, are likely to result in significant impacts to:

- ornamental and agricultural plants irrigated with recycled water throughout IRWD's service area (Trussell Technologies, Inc., Technical Memorandum: Review of the Proposed Water Quality Requirements for the Huntington Beach Desalter, Apr. 13, 2016, pp. 74-75);
- surface receiving waters in reservoirs accepting discharges of recycled water, based on the potential for exceedances of IRWD's NPDES permit requirements governing such discharges (RWQCB, Order No. RS-2015-0024/NPDES No. CA8000326).

These impacts not only must be evaluated in a properly prepared new or subsequent EIR pursuant to CEQA, but the potential adverse impacts to IRWD's recycled water program

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

due to decreased demand for recycled water must also be analyzed for contravention of SWRCB Policy for Water Quality Control for Recycled Water (Resolution 2013-0003).

A3-27
cont.

The treatment of sewage and production of recycled water using current technologies available at the MWRP would not be effective to remove or reduce the significant increases in boron and TDS concentrations that are reasonably likely to occur upon implementation of the Recharge Distribution Components to the same low levels currently characterizing IRWD's recycled water. The magnitude of these increases would be dependent upon the end use of Product Water, e.g., how and where Product Water is injected into the Basin, and cannot be determined until detailed plans for injection alternatives are made available. Nevertheless, increased concentrations of TDS in Product Water are reasonably likely to result in IRWD recycled water discharged into storage reservoirs exceeding RWQCB permit requirements for TDS. See RWQCB, Order No. RS-2015-0024/NPDES No. CA8000326. These potential adverse surface water quality impacts must be evaluated in a properly prepared new or subsequent EIR pursuant to CEQA.

Water Supply Impacts. Another potentially significant adverse impact of OCWD recharging a large volume of Product Water into the Basin as a component of the Current Desal Project is that it would impair the ability to capture and recharge the Basin aquifer using above average storm water flows and above average base flows that occur in the Santa Ana River. Even with the additional wells and groundwater recovery infrastructure that OCWD has described as comprising the Recharge Distribution Components, as described in Section III.C.2, recharging the Basin aquifer with a large volume of Product Water on a long-term basis would likely result in much higher groundwater levels and shallower depths to groundwater in the Basin. Continuous long-term recharge of the Basin aquifer with Product Water would maintain high groundwater levels, which would provide limited available aquifer capacity to store above average storm water and above average base flows in the Santa Ana River. Storm water and freshwater base flows are a current primary source of recharge to the Basin and are relied upon by the groundwater producers. The recharge of the Basin using Product Water rather than storm flows and base flows would in effect result in many hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of Santa Ana River water being lost to the ocean that otherwise would have been recharged into the Basin over the life of the Desal Project. This loss of access to an existing source of water that is currently used by the groundwater producers is another significant environmental impact, and the potential impact to beneficial uses also needs to be evaluated in a properly prepared, comprehensive new or subsequent EIR pursuant to CEQA.

A3-28

In summary, the DSEIR fails to comply with CEQA requirements triggering the preparation of a subsequent EIR, and fails as an informational document because it does not disclose or address the Current Desal Project's potentially significant adverse water quality and water supply impacts. The impacts associated with construction and operation of the Recharge Distribution Components are not evaluated in any CEQA document prepared for any iteration of the Desal Project to date, and neither the 2010 FSEIR nor the DSEIR address the Recharge Distribution Components. The CSLC is responsible for preparing a subsequent EIR that includes the 2010 Desal Project changes, including construction and operation of facilities necessary to implement the Recharge Distribution Components as a part of its project description, and evaluates the potential environmental effects therefrom.

A3-29

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

D. Significant New Information Necessitates Preparation of a Subsequent EIR.

A3-30

As discussed in Section II.B.2.b, MWDOC published the *OC Study* in 2016, which documents that water supply reliability in Orange County is achievable through 2040 with implementation of regional and local banking, groundwater management, indirect potable reuse, and wastewater recycling plans and programs. This new information should be evaluated in a new or subsequent EIR because this information requires major changes to the 2010 FSEIR by calling into question the validity of the Desal Project purpose and objectives as carried forward into the DSEIR, and presents new or considerably different project design features, mitigation measures, and alternatives available to reduce one or more significant adverse impacts of the Desal Project. See Pub. Resources Code § 21166; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15162, 15163(a), (b).

CEQA requires additional review if new information of substantial importance to the project, which was not known and could not have been known at the time with the exercise of reasonable diligence when EIR was certified, becomes available. Pub. Resources Code § 21166(c). New information relevant to a project is of substantial importance and requires preparation of a new or subsequent EIR if new information shows that any one of the following conditions exists:

- The project will have one or more new significant effects not evaluated in the prior EIR;
- Significant effects previously examined in the prior EIR will be substantially more severe than shown in the prior EIR; or
- New or considerably different feasible project design features or mitigation measures, or new or considerably different alternatives not previously examined in the prior EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant adverse impacts that the applicant declines to adopt.²²

See CEQA Guidelines § 15162(a)(3); see also 2 Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act (Cont.Ed.Bar 2015) § 19.18.

1. **The Orange County Water Reliability Study Constitutes New Information Regarding Sufficient Water Supply and System Reliability in Orange County for the Foreseeable Future and Calls into Question the 2010 FSEIR Project Purpose and Objectives.**

A3-31

As documented in the *OC Study*, water supply and system reliability can be achieved throughout the county through MWDSC and MWDSC member agency planned projects and programs and by optimizing the use of the Basin using methods that are consistent with existing OCWD policies for managing the Basin. *Id.* at p. 3-6 – 3-8. Among the *OC Study*'s recommendations are: advocacy for the WaterFix, regional storage and water banking, water recycling, groundwater production, and groundwater indirect potable reuse. *Id.* at p. 4-1.

²² New and more severe environmental impacts not addressed in the 2010 SEIR or the DSEIR, particularly to Basin groundwater quality and IRWD's recycled water program, are discussed in Section III.C.3.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

The *OC Study* identifies a suite of regional water supply projects that would likely be implemented by MWDSC and MWDSC member agencies in response to the shortages identified for the baseline Scenario 2a. *Id.* at p. 3-1. The OC Workgroup evaluated the regional portfolio of projects for effectiveness in offsetting the shortages identified in Scenario 2a. *Id.* at p. 3-5 – 3-6. The *OC Study* concludes the following:

- With respect to the Brea/La Habra and Basin areas, “remaining shortages after implementing MWDSC regional Portfolio B would be small enough to manage by enhanced groundwater management or additional conservation.”
- With respect to the South Orange County area, there are multiple cost effective projects and programs in which both supply and system reliability needs of South Orange County can be met.

Id. at pp. 3-6, 3-8. In other words, the Desal Project is not needed to meet Orange County water supply and system reliability goals through 2040.

2. A New or Subsequent EIR Must be Prepared to Update the 2010 FSEIR Project Purpose and Objectives Based on New Information of Substantial Importance to the Desal Project in the *OC Study* and the Desal Amendment.

The new information in the *OC Study* revealed that water supply reliability is achievable with implementation of MWDSC and MWDSC member agencies’ likely plans and programs in combination with a cost effective South Orange County portfolio of projects and programs. This revelation is of substantial importance to the Desal Project because it calls into question the continued viability of the project purpose and objectives identified in the 2010 FSEIR as carried forward into the DSEIR, *i.e.*, “to . . . strengthen regional self-reliance and satisfy regional water supply planning goals.” 2010 FSEIR, pp. 3-80, 3-95; DSEIR, p. 2-3. Based on the conclusions of the *OC Study*, the Desal Project is not needed to satisfy these purposes or objectives because there are portfolios of projects and programs other than the Desal Project which, in combination, are sufficient through the year 2040 to:

- Reduce local dependence on MWDSC water because *MWDSC water is available in amounts sufficient to meet reliability goals*;
- Improve regional self-reliance because *Orange County groundwater management, conservation, and regional and local water projects provide for ongoing self-reliance*; and
- Meet water supply and system reliability regional planning goals.

In light of this new information, a new or subsequent EIR must be prepared based on updated project purpose and objectives that accurately reflect this new information of substantial relevance to the Desal Project regarding Orange County’s water supply reliability.

The 2010 FSEIR project objectives as incorporated into the DSEIR are grounded in outdated and inaccurate assumptions regarding a water supply problem that does not exist,

A3-31
cont.

A3-32

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

namely: there is a foreseeable and unaddressed water supply shortage in Orange County. Because these 2010 FSEIR and DSEIR objectives are grounded in the inaccurate assumption that there is a water supply problem, the 2010 SEIR objectives inevitably resulted in identification of a range of alternatives that constitute a solution to the problem, even if though current information shows that the problem does not exist. See CEQA Guidelines, § 15124(b) (project objectives are directly related to the range of alternatives analyzed in an EIR); *North Coast Rivers Alliance v. Kawamura* (2015) 243 Cal.App.4th 647, 669 (holding the definition of project objectives improperly limited the analysis of alternatives where assumptions underlying the project objective could become inaccurate or unattainable at any time). The CSLC is required to prepare a new or subsequent EIR with updated project purpose and objectives that accurately reflect the new information of substantial importance to the Desal Project regarding water supply reliability in the *OC Study*.

A3-32
cont.

Further, the new information revealed by the *OC Study* combined with the adoption of the Desal Amendment requires that a new or subsequent EIR be prepared to support RWQCB analysis and issuance of desalination feasibility determinations regarding the identified need for Product Water based on consideration of adopted regional and local water supply planning documents. Pursuant to the Desal Amendment, the RWQCB must analyze, in consultation with the CSLC, CCC, and other responsible and trustee agencies, whether an identified need for Product Water exists. Desal Amendment § III.M.2.b(2). This RWQCB determination must be reviewed in CEQA documentation or a CEQA functional equivalent. DSEIR p. 1-8. In light of the new information in the *OC Study* and the requirements of the Desal Amendment, the CSLC must prepare a new or subsequent EIR because:

- CEQA review and documentation is required for the RWQCB's Desal Amendment feasibility determinations;
- the Desal Amendment requires coordination between the RWQCB and the CSLC in completing the feasibility analysis and issuing those determinations; and
- CSLC agreed in the Permitting Agreement to facilitate the CEQA review necessary for issuance of required RWQCB approvals.

In addition, a new or subsequent EIR must take into account the findings of the *OC Study* regarding the ability to provide reliable water supply in Orange County without reliance on the Desal Project.

3. A New or Subsequent EIR Must Analyze a Revised Reasonable Range of Alternatives in Light of Changes to the Desal Project and New Information of Substantial Importance to that Project.

A3-33

To comply with CEQA, a new or subsequent EIR must both evaluate the new supply reliability information in the *OC Study* and the resulting proper formulation of (i) project purpose and objectives, (ii) a new project description that accurately reflects the Recharge Distribution Components and all associated conveyance, injection, storage, recovery, and delivery infrastructure. A new or subsequent EIR must also evaluate the Outfall/Intake Components, (iii) associated potentially significant impacts, and (iv) an updated reasonable range of

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

alternatives designed to reduce or eliminate significant project impacts. CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(a); *Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside* (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 477 (scope of the alternatives analysis must be considered in light of the nature of the project, the project's impacts, relevant agency policies, and other material facts).

A3-33
cont.

The discussion of mitigation and alternatives is “the core of an EIR.” *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 564. One of CEQA's principal objectives is to ensure that public agencies systematically identify both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that will avoid or substantially lessen such effects. Pub. Resources Code, § 21002. New information of substantial importance to Desal Project implementation, related refinements to the Desal Project purpose and objectives, and new information regarding the Current Desal Project, including the Recharge Distribution Components and associated new and more substantial impacts, all require an updated identification and evaluation of feasible alternatives that meet project purpose and objectives and reduce significant adverse impacts.

(a) New Alternatives Recommended for Evaluation.

Based on a required updated and refined Desal Project purpose and objectives, and new information relevant to the Desal Project presented by the *OC Study*, the 2015 IRP,²³ IRWD's August 26, 2015 research paper titled “Improving Orange County Water Reliability: Comparing Alternatives” (IRWD 2015 Reliability Alternatives Report) (Aug. 26, 2015),²⁴ and OCWD's Long-Term Facilities Plan 2014 Update (OCWD Facilities Plan) (Nov. 19, 2014),²⁵ the new or updated subsequent EIR should explore the following alternatives for meeting the Desal Project's updated purpose and objectives, that are likely to reduce significant adverse impacts associated with the Desal Project:

1. **The Orange County Basin Optimization Program.** The Orange County Basin Optimization Program would optimize water storage within the Basin by maximizing purchases of MWDSC water in years when available, with the goal of storing more water in the Basin. This would keep the Basin fuller and closer to the top of the current Basin operating range. This program, in combination with managing the Basin with OCWD's existing management tools (e.g., the Basin Production Percentage (BPP) and the Replenishment Assessment), would result in maintaining higher groundwater levels during non-shortage years. During water short years, this stored water could then be utilized to the benefit of the Groundwater Producers. This approach would provide ample supplies during a multi-year MWDSC Water Supply Allocation. By directly serving MWDSC Tier-1 treated water during wet years in-lieu of pumping groundwater when Basin recharge facilities are full, and recharging MWDSC Tier-1 untreated water when there is extra recharge capacity in the Basin, the supplies stored in the Basin would increase. This would provide a much more cost-effective approach to improving Orange County's water supply reliability than either the 2010 Desal Project or the Current Desal Project. The details and feasibility of Orange County Basin Optimization Program are documented in the IRWD 2015 Reliability Alternatives Report.

A3-34

²³ See footnote 7, *supra*.

²⁴ See footnote 6, *supra*.

²⁵ See footnote 8, *supra*.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

The Orange County Basin Optimization Program would meet the project objectives identified on page 3-95 of the 2010 FSEIR as follows:

A3-34
cont.

- Provide a reliable local source of potable water to Orange County that is sustainable independent of climatic conditions and the availability of imported water supplies or local groundwater supplies because *the stored water would reliably offset MWDSC water delivery reductions during water short years over a wide range of conditions.*
- Provide Basin recharge water that not only meets the drinking water requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act and the California Department of Public Health, but would also avoid the adverse groundwater and surface water quality impacts as well as water supply impacts discussed in Section III.C.3 that could result from recharge of the Basin with Product Water because *MWDSC water used to directly or indirectly recharge the Basin would comply with the applicable regulatory requirements that protect groundwater and surface water, including Basin Plan objectives, NPDES permit limitations, and the Antidegradation Policy.*
- Avoid water supply impacts discussed in Section III.C.3 that could result from the use of Product Water to recharge the Basin because *management of purchases of MWDSC water would be governed by the capacity of, and the need to recharge the Basin and to maximize the use of storm water and base flows in the Santa Ana River, rather than a contractual obligation to purchase and use all Product Water every year for the next 50 years.*
- Decrease energy use, ecosystem, and biologic resource pressures and adverse impacts associated with production of new Product Water by *relying on existing water resources and by optimizing storage using supplies that are already available.*
- Minimize demands on the existing imported water system *because increased demands for imported water when optimizing the storage and use of the Basin would be extremely small when compared to MWDSC's 1.8 to 1.9 million acre-feet annual sales.*

2. **Implementation of the MWDSC IRP Recommendations.** The 2015 IRP forecasts improvements to water supply reliability in Orange County resulting from implementation of adaptive management strategy as applied to the development of local supplies and conservation in MWDSC's service area, as described in the 2015 IRP, as along with the MWDSC and MWDSC member agency projects and programs discussed above in Sections II.B and III.D.1.

A3-35

The MWDSC IRP recommended adaptive management strategy is best described in the 2015 IRP as follows:

"The fundamental goal of the IRP is for Southern California to have as reliable a water system for tomorrow as the region has enjoyed for decades, regardless of the challenges that emerge along the way. Metropolitan plans to meet this goal

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

through an adaptive management strategy that is the cornerstone of the 2015 IRP Update.” 2015 IRP, p. VI.

A3-35
cont.

“Adaptive water management, as opposed to a rigid set of planned actions over the coming decades, is the most nimble and cost-effective manner for Metropolitan and local water districts throughout Southern California to effectively prepare for the future.” *Id.* at p. IX.

“This strategy for continued water supply reliability includes a diversified portfolio of actions that calls for stabilizing and maintaining imported supplies; meeting future growth through increased water conservation and the development of new – and protection of existing – local supplies; pursuing a comprehensive transfers and exchanges strategy; building storage in wet and normal years to manage risks and drought; and preparing for uncertainty with Future Supply Actions.” *Id.* at p. 6.5.

The implementation of this diversified portfolio of actions would ensure water supply reliability in Orange County and avoid significant adverse impacts associated with the Desal Project and the water supply impacts resulting from the Recharge Distribution Components discussed in Section III.C.3.

3. **OCWD’s Groundwater Replenishment System Final Expansion Project (GWRS Expansion).** The OCWD Facility Plan identifies the GWRS Expansion as a water reuse project that creates additional drought-proof drinking water supply by expanding highly purified recycled water facilities from 100 million gallons per day (MGD) to 130 MGD at the lowest cost of water for Southern California.²⁶ The GWRS Expansion would provide an additional 33,600 AFY supply of recharge water. *Id.*, App. 1, p. 1. On July 19, 2017, the OCWD Board awarded a contract for the final design of the GWRS Expansion. This project would avoid the significant adverse impacts associated with the Desal Project and the water supply impacts resulting from the Recharge Distribution Components discussed in Section III.C.3.

A3-36

4. **Western Wellfield Project.** The OCWD Facility Plan identifies that,

“[T]here are a number of ways to decrease outflow to Los Angeles County by increasing production near the county line. Potential projects include: 1) Coastal Agencies paying for well construction and connection costs for wells in northwest Orange County and then connecting these wells to the West OC Water Board Pipelines to service the Coastal Agencies; 2) Increasing the Basin Production Percentage of producers in the vicinity of the county line, such as Fullerton and Anaheim, thereby shifting pumping closer to the county line; and 3) OCWD constructing four production wells near the county line and building a discharge pipeline to the West OC Water Board Pipeline.²⁷ The objective of this project is to decrease groundwater losses to Los Angeles County.”

A3-37

²⁶ See footnote 8, *supra*.

²⁷ See footnote 8, *supra*.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Id., App. 1, p. 6. The reduction of losses to Los Angeles County would help ensure water supply reliability in Orange County and avoid the significant adverse impacts associated with the Desal Project and the water supply impacts resulting from the Recharge Distribution Components discussed in Section III.C.3.

A3-37
cont.

5. **Deep Aquifer Recovery and Treatment.** IRWD operates its Deep Aquifer Treatment facility to make use of the good quality water located in the deep aquifer that has a brownish tint imparted from the remains of ancient vegetation. The use of supplies located in the Deep Aquifer does not substantially impact storage in the main aquifer of the Basin and could therefore be relied upon to improve water supply reliability in Orange County. The increased use of water in the Deep Aquifer would help to ensure water supply reliability in Orange County and avoid the significant adverse impacts associated with the Desal Project and the water supply impacts resulting from the Recharge Distribution Components discussed in Section III.C.3.

A3-38

(b) **Alternatives Rejected in the 2010 FSEIR Recommended for Reevaluation.**

A3-39

To be consistent with the refined Desal Project purpose and objectives, as well as new and available information relevant to the Desal Project presented by the *OC Study*, Term Sheet, 2015 IRP, IRWD 2015 Reliability Alternatives Report, the alternatives discussed above, and the DSEIR, the updated new or subsequent EIR should reevaluate the following alternatives which were rejected in the FSEIR because they comply with the Desal Project's purpose and objectives, including improving Orange County's water supply reliability, and are likely to reduce significant adverse impacts associated with the Desal Project:

- Alternative Site
- Alternative Ownership and Operation
- Alternative Facility Configuration
- Reduced Facility Size

The DSEIR improperly eliminates from further consideration the first three listed alternatives because they would entail onshore components outside the jurisdiction of the CSLC's approval of the Outfall/Intake Components and, it is claimed, are therefore beyond the scope of the DSEIR. DSEIR, pp. 5-9 – 10. Elimination of these alternatives is based on an inaccurate and incomplete project description that defines the CSLC's approval under consideration as limited to changes to the 2010 Desal Project and comprised only of the Outfall/Intake Components. The elimination ignores the changes to the Product Water delivery and distribution through the Recharge Distribution Components that make up the Current Desal Project as it exists in 2017. If the CSLC had prepared a subsequent EIR as required under CEQA, including an accurate, complete, and unsegmented project description consisting of the changes to the 2010 Desal Project, including the Recharge Distribution Components and the Outfall/Intake Components, these three alternatives would not have been eliminated from further consideration.

A3-40

Furthermore, the DSEIR wrongly concludes that these alternatives need not be considered because they are outside of the CSLC's Lease Premises. See *id.* at p. 5-7. It is

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

inconsistent with CEQA's purpose to ignore off-site alternatives simply because on-site alternatives are being considered. *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1988) 197 Cal.App.3d 1167, 1179. As such, the Alternative Site, Alternative Ownership and Operation, and Alternative Facility Configuration alternatives should be further evaluated for their consistency with the CEQA screening criteria in a new or subsequent EIR prepared pursuant to CEQA to determine whether one or more should be carried forward for further analysis as alternatives to eliminate or reduce significant project impacts.

A3-40
cont.

The DSEIR also improperly eliminates from further consideration the Reduced Facility Size Alternative. The 2010 FSEIR's Reduced Facility Size Alternative, which would produce approximately 25 MGD or half of the Product Water produced by the preferred alternative), is rejected as an alternative in the DSEIR on the grounds that it would not (i) contribute desalinated water to satisfy regional water supply planning goals; (ii) improve water supply reliability; or (iii) avoid or reduce significant impacts. DSEIR, Tab. 5-2. Not only does the DSEIR fail to explain why a Reduced Facility Size Alternative that produces 25 MGD does not meet project objectives, but it also fails to take into account the new water supply and system reliability documented in the *OC Study* as discussed in Sections II.B.2 and III.D.1.

A3-41

Contrary to the DSEIR's conclusory statement that the Reduced Facility Size Alternative would not meet project objectives, the Reduced Facility Size Alternative meets the majority, if not all, of the Desal Project's objectives as stated in the DSEIR and the 2010 FSEIR by: (1) using proven technology to provide a long-term water source and (2) contributing desalinated water to satisfy regional water supply planning goals. See DSEIR, p. ES-6 (summarizing the project objectives); CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(c) (a potentially feasible alternative may be eliminated from further consideration if it fails to meet *most* of the basic project objectives or is unable to avoid significant environmental effects of the project under review); *Habitat & Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz* (2013) 213 Cal.App.4th 1277, 1304 (alternative could not be eliminated from consideration solely because it would impede to some extent the attainment of the project's objectives). Furthermore, the DSEIR fails to explain how a Reduced Facility Size Alternative would not reduce significant environmental impacts to ocean water quality and marine biological resources, regional air quality impacts associated with construction of the Desal Project. See DSEIR, p. 5-4; *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.*, *supra*, at p. 404 (conclusory comments used to eliminate alternatives from further consideration does not foster informed decision-making and informed public participation).

The DSEIR is devoid of any legally relevant basis for eliminating the Reduced Facility Size Alternative from further consideration. The DSEIR's decision to summarily dismiss a smaller facility as incapable of meeting regional water supply goals or improving water supply reliability is without basis. The DSEIR also fails to identify the specific "regional water supply planning goals" that cannot be met with a smaller facility, or to include a consistency analysis supporting its conclusion that a smaller facility is inconsistent with such goals. As the California Supreme Court recently held in *Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Association of Governments*, Case No. S223603, 2017 Cal. LEXIS 5125 (Jul. 13, 2017), to be adequate, an EIR must include a fact-based analysis of project consistency with long-term planning objectives. *Id.* at p. *31. The DSEIR's conclusory discussion and rejection of the Reduced Facility Size Alternative fails to meet CEQA's substantive and procedural requirements.

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

(c) Alternatives that are Not Recommended for Evaluation because They are Unlikely to Reduce Adverse Impacts.

A3-42

Based on the updated and refined Desal Project purpose and objectives, and the changes and potential adverse impacts of the 2010 Desal Project, a new or subsequent EIR must evaluate feasible alternatives that could reduce one or more of the significant adverse impacts of the Current Desal Project. These potential impacts include groundwater quality, surface water quality, and water supply impacts resulting from the Recharge Distribution Components discussed in Section III.C.3. Information developed as a part of OCWD's ongoing planning and conceptual design work on a delivery system for Product Water, as required by the Term Sheet, indicates that one alternative to the Current Desal Project that may be evaluated is a Desal Project incorporating "In-Lieu Distribution Components" as the delivery system for Product Water in place of the Surface/Potable Distribution System and/or the Recharge Distribution Components. (In-Lieu Distribution Alternative). OCWD includes this type of distribution method in its Option 6 proposal, which would deliver Product Water to the coastal groundwater producing agencies in lieu of those agencies producing groundwater from the Basin. This would result in the in-lieu recharge of the aquifer. Although this alternative may be recommended for evaluation, it will not avoid or mitigate the significant adverse environmental impacts of the Current Desal Project which must be avoided to protect the existing high quality local water supplies.

The In-Lieu Distribution Components would deliver and distributed Product Water directly to Orange County retail water supply agencies in the current groundwater conveyance system in-lieu of recovering supply from groundwater pumping from the Basin, incidentally resulting in additional recharge to the Basin due to decreased groundwater pumping. As studied and documented by IRWD, implementation of the In-Lieu Distribution Component, like implementation of the Recharge Distribution Components, would result in significant adverse impacts to IRWD's recycled water quality and system. This information has been presented to OCWD and the Applicant in IRWD's March 8, 2016 presentation of preliminary analysis results, as well as adverse water supply impacts. IRWD Presentation to OCWD.

Because Product Water that is much higher in TDS and boron would be delivered in lieu of high quality groundwater as potable water to IRWD customers, customer use of the lower quality potable water will result in sewage that is also higher in boron and TDS concentrations being delivered to the MWRP as influent. Treatment of influent that is much higher in these pollutants is reasonably likely to result in adverse impacts on the quality of recycled water produced at the MWRP and then distributed throughout IRWD's recycled water system because the MWRP treatment facilities cannot remove these pollutants. As noted in Section III.C.3. above, IRWD and its consultants have preliminarily evaluated the potential adverse impacts of Product Water pollutants on the quality of recycled water produced for, and served to IRWD customers. Further, IRWD has made these results public. For example, IRWD has shared them with OCWD and the Applicant in a letter dated March 8, 2016. See IRWD Presentation to OCWD. This preliminary evaluation indicates that the higher constituent levels in Product Water would not be sufficiently removed during the MWRP treatment process, which in turn is expected to result in:

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

- Significant adverse impacts to ornamental and agricultural plants irrigated with recycled water throughout IRWD's service area, which is likely to reduce demand for recycled water in contravention of SWRCB Policy for Water Quality Control for Recycled Water;²⁸ and
- Discharges into recycled water storage reservoirs exceeding NPDES permit requirements for TDS and adversely affecting surface water reservoirs. See RWQCB Order No. RS-2015-0024/NPDES No. CA8000326.

A3-42
cont.**IV. THE CSLC CANNOT LAWFULLY APPROVE THE OUTFALL/INTAKE COMPONENTS BASED ON THE DSEIR, WHICH IS INADEQUATE.**

A3-43

Even if it were somehow legally appropriate for the CSLC to conduct focused CEQA review addressing only the Outfall/Intake Components rather than preparing a comprehensive new or subsequent EIR, the DSEIR is inadequate even the narrow purposes of the CSLC's focused review and approval of the proposed Outfall/Intake Components. As documented in this Section IV, the DSEIR fails as an informational document because it (i) defines impermissibly narrow project objectives, (ii) fails to consider a reasonable range of alternatives, (iii) fails to incorporate a sufficient cumulative impacts analysis, and (iv) fails to identify, fully evaluate, and consider appropriate mitigation for a number of environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Outfall/Intake Components under consideration by the CSLC.

A. The Statement of Project Objectives in the DSEIR is Impermissibly Narrow.

A3-44

The statement of project objectives must relate to the underlying purpose of the project under review. CEQA Guidelines, § 15124(b); *Habitat & Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz*, *supra*, 213 Cal.App.4th at p. 1299. The DSEIR includes among the project objectives "obtaining the necessary approvals" from the RWQCB and the CCC. DSEIR, p. 2-3. This objective does not illuminate the underlying purpose of the Desal Project. See *Habitat & Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz*, *supra*, 213 Cal.App.4th at p. 1299. The DSEIR identifies the following underlying purposes of the Project: to affordably provide a long-term, reliable source of water, to reduce local dependence on imported water, and to contribute desalinated water to satisfy regional water supply planning goals. See DSEIR, p. 2-3.

The DSEIR's definition of the project objectives in terms of obtaining the regulatory approvals (e.g., coastal development permit) specifically necessary to construct and operate intakes, wedgewire screens, and a multiport diffuser for the Desal Project unduly limits the selection of feasible alternatives that can satisfy the underlying project purpose, i.e., to provide an affordable and reliable regional water supply. See CEQA Guidelines, § 15124(b) (project objectives are directly related to the range of alternatives analyzed in an EIR). Such a narrow characterization of project objectives is also improper because it jettisons the CSLC's goal to ensure a **cost-effective**, reliable local water supply and presupposes the approval of the Desal Project. As a result, and as further discussed in Section IV.B, the DSEIR is invalid because it fails to consider a range of alternatives that allows for informed decision-making. See *Mann v.*

²⁸ SWRCB, Policy for Water Quality Control for Recycled Water (Jan. 2013) available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_recycling_policy/docs/rwp_revto.pdf

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Hawthorne (1991) 233 Cal.App.3d 1143, 1151.

A3-44
cont.

B. The Alternatives Analysis is Inadequate.

A3-45

The alternatives analysis in the DSEIR is inadequate because it fails to identify the rationale for selecting those potentially feasible alternatives eliminated from further consideration and fails to include a reasonable range of alternatives. These errors are fatal to the DSEIR and for this reason, the DSEIR must be revised to include an adequate alternatives analysis and recirculated for public review and comment.

1. The DSEIR Fails to Disclose the CSLC's Rationale for Selecting Potentially Feasible Alternatives.

A3-46

An EIR is required to explain the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(c). The DSEIR identifies the following six potentially feasible alternatives and concludes that each alternative fails to meet one or more screening criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6:

- Intake Pipeline Extension (increased construction-related impacts)
- Two-port Diffuser (feasibility)
- Beach Well Intake (increased impacts)
- Subsurface Infiltration Gallery Intake (increased impacts)
- Alternative Discharge Location (technically infeasible)
- Alternative Discharge Design – Diffuser (does not reduce impacts).

DSEIR, pp. 5-6 – 8, Tab. 5-2. However, the DSEIR fails to explain the rationale for selecting these particular alternatives or identify the impacts that may be avoided with the implementation of these alternatives. Indeed, three of the six potentially feasible alternatives would result in greater environmental impacts than the Desal Project. For these reasons, the alternatives analysis in the DSEIR must be revised to fully document the logic behind the selection of potentially feasible alternatives in order that the public and decision-makers may determine whether the alternatives considered are consistent with CEQA's principal objective of avoiding potentially significant impacts where feasible.

2. The Range of Alternatives Evaluated is Unreasonable.

A3-47

An EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives. CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(a). The scope of the alternatives analysis must be considered in light of the nature of the project, the project's impacts, relevant agency policies, and other material facts. *Mira Mar Mobile Community v. City of Oceanside* (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 477. The key criterion in judging the adequacy of the range of alternatives analyzed in an EIR is whether the alternatives considered provide enough variation with respect to environmental concerns to allow for

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

informed decision-making. *Mann v. Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Hawthorne* (1991) 233 Cal.App.3d 1143, 1151.) The DSEIR fails this test.

A3-47
cont.

The alternatives carried forward for detailed analysis in the DSEIR are the No Project Alternative — an alternative that is legally required to be included in an EIR — and alternative engineering designs of the two Outfall/Intake Components (Rotating Brush-Cleaned, Stainless Steel Wedgewire Screens Alternative and the Six-Port Diffuser Alternative). The range of alternatives is unreasonable because it fails to present enough of a variation to allow for informed decision-making. See *Mann v. Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Hawthorne*, *supra*, 233 Cal.App.3d at p. 1151.

3. The DSEIR Fails to Evaluate Significant Environmental Impacts.

A3-48

The DSEIR fails to identify, fully evaluate, and consider feasible mitigation measures for a number of significant environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Outfall/Intake Components, including air quality, greenhouse gas emission, energy use, noise, transportation and hazardous conditions impacts.

C. The DSEIR Fails to Identify and Address Cumulative Impacts Likely to be Associated with the Reasonably Foreseeable Recharge Distribution Components.

Although the proper characterization of the Recharge Distribution Components under CEQA is as an element of the Current Desal Project, the CSLC is required by CEQA to at least identify the Recharge Distribution Components as a reasonably foreseeable project for purposes of conducting an analysis of potentially significant adverse cumulative impacts.

The cumulative impacts analysis of the DSEIR is required to, but has not identified and analyzed the Recharge Distribution Components as a reasonably foreseeable future project. Supplemental EIRs are required to identify all reasonably foreseeable or “probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts [with the project under review], including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency.” *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376, 396-397; CEQA Guidelines, § 15130, subd. (b)(1)(A). A project need not be formally approved, nor precisely defined in order to qualify as a reasonably foreseeable future project. *Ibid.* A significant investment of time and financial resources in preparation for formal regulatory review of a project is sufficient to qualify a project as reasonably foreseeable. 2 Kostka & Zischke, Practice Under the California Environmental Quality Act, § 13.42, p. 13-43.

The Recharge Distribution Components under development by OCWD are reasonably foreseeable, as reflected in OCWD’s Board minutes, staff presentations, and other materials. See, e.g., OCWD, *Workshop #3: Distribution of Poseidon Resources Ocean Desalinated Water* (Jul. 6, 2016). OCWD staff’s presentation at an OCWD Board of Directors meeting held on July 6, 2016 indicates that OCWD had committed Recharge Distribution Components as a method of distributing Product Water, having invested considerable staff resources toward refining, planning, and conceptually designing this proposal. *Id.*, Slide 4. In short, there is “telling evidence” that OCWD had formulated “a reasonably definite proposal for the development” of

COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT (cont.)

the Recharge Distribution Components long before CSLC issued the Notice of Preparation of the DSEIR. *Laurel Heights*, supra, 47 Cal.3d at p. 397.

A3-48
cont.

The DSEIR states that although the 2010 FSEIR analyzed construction and operation of a distribution and delivery system component of the 2010 Desal Project, the only reason that the Recharge Distribution Components are not considered at least as a reasonably foreseeable projects in the cumulative impacts analysis of the DSEIR is because the CSLC deems them to be “speculative” as “OCWD staff placed on hold any plans to begin an extensive environmental impacts analysis” of the Recharge Distribution Components. DSEIR pp. 1-2, 3-7. Whether or not an agency has, for the moment and subject to reconsideration at any time, placed environmental review of a project on hold is not the test for whether it is a reasonably foreseeable project for purposes of cumulative impacts analysis. Instead, the test is whether there is “telling evidence” that OCWD had formulated “a reasonably definite proposal for the development” of the Recharge Distribution Components. *Id.* The available information regarding the Recharge Distribution Components is sufficiently developed for evaluation of potential adverse cumulative groundwater and surface water quality, as well as recycled water impacts. However, that cumulative impacts analysis has not been conducted in the DSEIR.

For the above reasons, the DSEIR is required, at a minimum, to consider the Recharge Distribution Components as part of the cumulative impacts analysis in the DSEIR. See CEQA Guidelines, § 15130, subd. (b)(1)(A). Failure to include the Recharge Distribution Components among the list of probable future projects and to conduct, at a minimum, an analysis of potentially significant cumulative water quality and water supply impacts associated with those components renders the DSEIR inadequate. In the event that for some reason CSLC is not required to prepare a new or subsequent EIR to fully evaluate the Current Desal Project, this inadequacy of the DSEIR can only be remedied by the preparation of a proper cumulative impacts analysis that considers the Recharge Distribution Components as a reasonably foreseeable project, and recirculation of the DSEIR.

V. CONCLUSION.

For all of the above reasons, an updated new or subsequent EIR that includes a complete and accurate project description and discussion of environmental effects, statement of purpose and objectives, and appropriate and feasible mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce Current Desal Project impacts must be prepared and circulated for public comment.

A3-49

If you have any questions, please contact Mary Lynn Coffee at (949) 833-7800.

Sincerely,



Mary Lynn Coffee
of Nossaman LLP

MLC:snc

cc: Mike Markus, General Manager, Orange County Water District
Hope Smythe, Executive Director, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
John Ainsworth, Executive Director, California Coastal Commission

RESPONSE TO COMMENT SET A3: IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT

A3-1 These introductory comments do not raise significant environmental issues. They state the concern of the Irvine Ranch Water District (District) regarding any potential significant adverse effects from the “Desal Project,” on the Orange County Groundwater Basin (Basin), from which the District derives the majority of its water supply. The commenter’s concern about impacts to the Basin will be provided to the California State Lands Commission (Commission or CSLC) for consideration in its decision-making process concerning Poseidon’s application to amend lease PRC 1980.1.

The term “Desal Project” is used by the commenter “to refer generically to the Seawater Desalination Project at Huntington Beach, and is not intended to refer specifically to either the 2010 Desal Project or the Current Desal Project....” The commenter later defines “Current Desal Project” as “the 2010 Desal Project plus all modifications to that project since the 2010 FSEIR, including entirely new and different planned distribution and delivery system project components for Project Water, new treatment technologies related to new and different Project Water end use specifications, and modifications to the Outfall/Intake Components under consideration by the CSLC.” These terms contrast significantly with the Commission’s definition of the scope of the project analyzed in this Supplemental EIR.

The Commission stands by its determination, provided in Supplemental EIR Section 1.4, *Purpose and Scope of Supplemental EIR*, that the proper scope for the Lease Modification Project is that provided in Poseidon’s lease amendment application and described in Supplemental EIR Section 2, *Project Description*, that preparation of a Supplemental EIR is appropriate for evaluation of the potential significant impacts associated with the Lease Modification Project, and that a new complete review of the 50 MGD HB Desalination Plant Project approved in 2010 does not consider the extensive environmental review that has already occurred, the Applicant’s vested rights, the characteristics of the proposed modifications, and other considerations. See master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission’s Discretionary Action*, MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, and MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*.

A3-2 See master response MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*.

- A3-3 See master response MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*.
- A3-4 See master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, and MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*.
- A3-5 See master response MR-4, *Piecemealing*.
- A3-6 See master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, and MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*.
- A3-7 See master response MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*.
- A3-8 See master response MR-8, *Alternatives*.
- A3-9 The commenter's statement that the Supplemental EIR is inadequate under CEQA will be provided to the Commission for consideration in its decision-making process concerning Poseidon's application to amend lease PRC 1980.1. The Project that will be considered by the Commission is the proposed Lease Modification Project, as defined in Section 2 of this Supplemental EIR. (See also master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, and MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*.)
- A3-10 See master response MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*.
- A3-11 See master response MR-8, *Alternatives*.
- A3-12 See master responses MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*, and MR-8, *Alternatives*.
- A3-13 The commenter's explanation of its water supply operations in its service area will be provided to the Commission for consideration in its decision-making process concerning Poseidon's application to amend lease PRC 1980.1. The Project that will be considered by the Commission is the proposed Lease Modification Project, as defined in Section 2 of this Supplemental EIR. (See also master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, and MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*.)
- A3-14 The summary of the project background appears consistent with that provided in the Supplemental EIR and does not raise significant environmental issues.

- A3-15 The commenter's summary of the Orange County Water District's development of the Recharge Distribution Components for the desalination project and the need for evaluation of the Recharge Distribution Components will be provided to the Commission for consideration in its decision-making process. The Project that will be considered by the Commission is the proposed Lease Modification Project, as defined in Section 2 of this EIR. (See also master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, and MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*.)
- A3-16 See master response MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR* regarding project need and water supply.
- A3-17 See master response MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, and MR-4, *Piecemealing*.
- A3-18 See master response MR-3, *Responsible vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental vs. Subsequent EIR*, Subpart 4D.2, *2015 Desalination Amendment and 2014 and 2015 ISTAP Reports*, regarding compliance with the Desalination Amendment.
- A3-19 through A3-32 See master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR* and MR-4, *Piecemealing*, including the discussion of groundwater recharge and speculative nature of how desalinated water might be used by the OCWD and distributed to the local water community.
- A3-33 through A3-42 See master response MR-8, *Alternatives*.
- A3-43 See master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*, MR-7, *Cumulative Impacts*, and MR-8, *Alternatives*.
- A3-44 See master response MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, and MR-8, *Alternatives*.
- A3-45 through A3-47 See master response MR-8, *Alternatives*.
- A3-48 See master responses MR-7, *Cumulative Impacts*, MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, and MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*, including the discussion of groundwater recharge and

speculative nature of how desalinated water might be used by the OCWD and distributed to the local water community

A3-49 See MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*, and MR-3, *Responsible Vs. Lead Agency & Supplemental Vs. Subsequent EIR*, and MR-8, *Alternatives*.

II.4.4 Comment Set A4: Santa Margarita Water District

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CHARLES GIBSON JUSTIN McCUSKER
SAUNDRA F. JACOBS BETTY H. OLSON, PH. D.
CHARLEY WILSON

DANIEL R. FERONS
GENERAL MANAGER



Santa Margarita Water District

July 26, 2017

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Lieutenant Governor
Chairman, California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Ave., Suite 100 South
Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

RE: Huntington Beach Desalination Project Supplemental EIR – SUPPORT

Dear Chairman Newsom,

Santa Margarita Water District (SMWD) strongly supports the development of new water resources in Orange County, including the Huntington Beach Seawater Desalination Project, and we respectfully request that the State Lands Commission certify the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) and approves an amended land lease with Poseidon Water at its meeting on October 19, 2017, so that this project can continue to move through the permitting process.

A4-1

South Orange County has very limited groundwater and its water agencies, including SMWD, depend heavily on imported water from Northern California and the Colorado River to meet the needs of their customers. While we have invested heavily in the development of recycled water supplies and conservation programs over the years, and we will continue to do so, ensuring long-term water reliability will also require developing new sources of supply. SMWD views seawater desalination as an important part of our future regional water supply portfolio.

It is prudent and necessary for SMWD to diversify its water supply portfolio to avoid over-reliance on any once source of water or strictly demand management measures. Balancing water supplies and demand management measures to include imported water, increased water storage, water conservation, water recycling, groundwater recharge, and seawater desalination are critical for Orange County maintaining an adequate, safe and reliable water supply portfolio. Seawater desalination would provide a significant benefit to Orange County by producing 56,000 acre-feet of potable water each year. It would help to reduce our dependence on imported water as well as provide us with a local, drought-proof supply source.

Again, SMWD urges State Lands Commission certification of the SEIR and approval of the amended land lease agreement with Poseidon Water, so that the Huntington Beach Seawater Desalination Project can continue through the permitting process.

Sincerely,

Daniel R. Ferons
General Manager

RESPONSE TO COMMENT SET A4: SANTA MARGARITA WATER DISTRICT

- A4-1 The commenter's support of the Project will be provided to the California State Lands Commission (Commission or CSLC) for consideration in its decision-making process. The Project that will be considered by the Commission is the proposed Lease Modification Project, as defined in Section 2 of this Supplemental EIR. (See also master responses MR-1, *Scope of the Commission's Discretionary Action*, and MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*.)

II.4.5 Comment Set A5: South Coast Air Quality Management District



South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

SENT VIA E-MAIL AND USPS:

July 12, 2017

CEQA.comments@slc.ca.gov

Alexandra Borack, Project Manager
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 92825

Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) for the Proposed Seawater Desalination Project at Huntington Beach (SCH No.: 2001051092)

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comments are meant as guidance for the Lead Agency and should be incorporated into the Final Supplemental EIR.

A5-1

Project Description and Air Quality Analysis

The proposed project consists of the modification to the existing Huntington Beach Generating Station Once Through Cooling (Poseidon OTC) seawater intake and discharge pipelines (“proposed project”). The proposed project includes two “technology enhancements” at the desalination facility: 1) the installation of a wedgewire screen at the end of the intake line, and 2) installation of a multiport diffuser on the offshore end of the outfall. Additionally, the proposed project will reduce seawater intake volume from 152 million gallon per day (MGD) that was approved in the 2010 Final Subsequent EIR (2010 Project Volume) to 106.7 MGD¹. In the Air Quality section, the Lead Agency found that the proposed project would exceed SCAQMD’s regional air quality CEQA significance thresholds for NO_x during construction. After incorporating Mitigation Measure CON-10 through CON-14², the Lead Agency found that the proposed project’s construction air quality impacts from NO_x emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

SCAQMD’s 2016 Air Quality Management Plan

On March 3, 2017, the SCAQMD’s Governing Board adopted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (2016 AQMP), which was later approved by the California Air Resources Board of Directors on March 23rd. The 2016 AQMP³ is a regional blueprint for achieving air quality standards and healthful air in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). Built upon the progress in implementing the 2007 and 2012 AQMPs, the 2016 AQMP provides a regional perspective on air quality and lays out the challenges facing the Basin. The most significant air quality challenge in the Basin is to reduce an additional 45 percent reduction in NO_x emissions in 2023 and an additional 55 percent reduction in NO_x emissions beyond 2031 levels for ozone attainment.

A5-2

Achieving NO_x emission reductions in a timely manner is critical to attaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone before the 2023 and 2031 deadlines. SCAQMD is committed to attain the ozone NAAQS as expeditiously as practicable. To further reduce construction emissions from NO_x, SCAQMD staff recommends changes to the existing Mitigation Measure (MM) CON-11 (Hauling Activities) and MM CON-14 (Diesel Fuel Reduction Plan) that were adopted in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the 2010 Final Subsequent EIR. Please see the attachment for more information.

A5-3

¹ Draft SEIR, Page ES-4.

² *Ibid.* Page 4-85.

³ South Coast Air Quality Management District, March 3, 2017. *2016 Air Quality Management Plan*. Accessed at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/library/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan>.

COMMENT SET A5: SOUTH COAST AQMD (cont.)

Ms. Alexandra Borack

July 12, 2017

Pursuant to the California Public Resources Code Section 21092.5 and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, SCAQMD staff requests that the Lead Agency provide the SCAQMD with written responses to all comments contained herein prior to the certification of the Final Supplemental EIR. Further, when the Lead Agency makes the finding that the recommended mitigation measures are infeasible, the Lead Agency shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting them in the Final Supplemental EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091).

A5-4

SCAQMD staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to address these issues and any other questions that may arise. Please contact Jack Cheng, Air Quality Specialist, CEQA IGR Section, at (909) 396-2448, if you have any questions regarding the enclosed comments.

Sincerely,

Lijin Sun

Lijin Sun, J.D.
Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

Attachment
LS:JC
ORC170530-02
Control Number

COMMENT SET A5: SOUTH COAST AQMD (cont.)

Ms. Alexandra Borack

July 12, 2017

ATTACHMENT

Recommended Changes to the Existing Mitigation Measures CON-11 and CON-14

A5-5

1. CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures go beyond what is required by law to minimize any significant impacts. To further reduce the significant construction impacts from NO_x emissions, SCAQMD staff recommends revisions to the Mitigation Measure (MM) CON-11 and MM CON-14 that the Lead Agency should include in the Final Supplemental EIR. Additional information on potential mitigation measures as guidance to the Lead Agency is available on the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook website⁴

Mitigation Measure CON-11 (Hauling Activities):

- All trucks that are to haul excavated or graded material on site shall comply with California Vehicle Code Section 23114(b)(F)(e)(4) as amended, regarding the prevention of materials spilling onto public streets and roads. Require the use of 2010 model year diesel haul trucks that conform to 2010 EPA truck standards or newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) for hauling activities, and if the Lead Agency determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel haul trucks cannot be obtained, the Lead Agency shall use trucks that meet EPA 2007 model year NO_x emissions requirements, at a minimum. Additionally, consider other measures such as incentives, phase-in schedules for clean trucks, etc. during the construction period. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the City of Huntington Beach Engineer how the project operations subject to that specification during hauling activities shall comply with the provision set forth in Sections 23114(b)(F)(e)(4).

•

Mitigation Measure CON-14 (Diesel Fuel Reduction Plan):

A5-6

- Use diesel powered equipment meeting Tier 2 4 CARB/U.S. EPA emission standards. ~~or higher emissions standards to the maximum extent feasible.~~ If not already supplied with a factory-equipped diesel particulate filter, all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emission reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. In addition, construction equipment shall incorporate, where feasible, emissions savings technology such as hybrid drives and specific fuel economy standards. In the event that all off-road diesel-powered construction equipment cannot meet the Tier 4 engine certification, the applicant shall use alternative measures, which include, but would not be limited to, reduction in the number and/or horsepower rating of construction equipment, limiting the number of daily construction haul truck trips to and from the proposed project, using cleaner vehicle fuel, and/or limiting the number of individual construction project phases occurring simultaneously. The effectiveness of alternative measures must be demonstrated through future study with written findings supported by substantial evidence that is approved by the Lead Agency before use.

⁴ South Coast Air Quality Management District. Accessed at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook>.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT SET A5: SOUTH COAST AQMD

- A5-1 The comment reviews the construction-related impacts and mitigation measures identified in the Supplemental EIR. These are introductory statements that do not raise significant environmental issues.
- A5-2 The comment notes that the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was adopted in March 2017. Supplemental EIR Section 4.3.2, *Air Quality, Regulatory Setting*, is revised to reflect this update. Reducing significant impacts associated with NO_x emissions generated by the Lease Modification Project (as defined in MR-2, *Lease Modification Project Scope*) would be achieved through implementation of the identified air quality mitigation measures identified in the Supplemental EIR.
- A5-3 The comment recommends changes to two mitigation measures adopted for the 2010 Project. The measures—2010 MM CON-11 and 2010 MM CON-14—apply to onshore construction and operation activities, outside the Commission’s jurisdiction. The Supplemental EIR is revised to incorporate the commenter’s recommendations into the Air Quality mitigation measures for the Lease Modification Project (MM CON-14a and MM CON-14b).
- A5-4 The comment requests written responses to these comments. As CEQA requires, these responses are an important component of this Final Supplemental EIR. Updated versions of the feasible mitigation MM CON-14a and MM CON-14b appear in this Final Supplemental EIR.
- A5-5 See Response to Comment A5-3.
- A5-6 See Response to Comment A5-3.